The American Ecclesiastical Review

Vol. CXVII, No. 1 JULY, 1947

CONTENTS

"Prayer and Work": An Ancient Formula for a Modern Crisis
Abbot Patrick M. O'Brien, O.S.B. 1

Pre-Columbian Devotion to Mary in America: The Testimony of the Kensington Stone
Raphael M. Huber, O.F.M.Conv. 7

St. Thomas Goes to Summer School
Thomas C. Donlan, O.P. 22

Challenge of the National Shrine . *Msgr. John J. Reilly* 29

The Status of Scholarship on St. Thomas More
James F. Larkin, C.S.V. 33

Learning in the Diocesan Priesthood
Joseph Clifford Fenton 43

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

The Funeral Absolution on Great Feasts 59

Holy Communion at Funeral Masses 59

Month's Mind and Anniversary Masses 60

Mass of a Lesser Feast in Occurrence 61

The Manner of Saying the Prayers After Low Mass . . 61

Meaning of the Raising of the Chasuble at the Elevation . 62

Titular Feast of a Church of St. Mary 63

Published monthly by The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C. Subscription price, currency: United States, $4.00; Canada, $4.50; Foreign, $5.00. 40 cents per copy.

Entered as second class matter, November 30, 1944, at the Post Office at Washington, D. C., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Accepted for mailing at the special rate of postage provided for under Act of March 5, 1930, under Act of February 28, 1925.

Business communications, including subscriptions and changes of address, should be addressed to The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C.

Please address all manuscripts and editorial correspondence to The Editor, The American Ecclesiastical Review, Box 20A, The Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C.

Copyright 1947, by The Catholic University of America Press

Contents Continued from Previous Page

The Office of a *Tonsuratus* at High Mass 63
Cheating a Slot Machine 64
Hearing Mass Over the Radio 65

ANALECTA 67

BOOK REVIEWS

La renuncia all'ufficio ecclesiastico nella storia del diritto canonico dalla eta' apostolica alla riforma Cattolica, *by Pier Giovanni Caron* 71
Under the Red Sun, *by Forbes J. Monaghan, S.J.* 73
The Holy Family, *by Denis O'Shea* 74
A Guide to Historical Method, *by Gilbert J. Garraghan, S.J.* . 74
The Gilgamesh Epic and Old Testament Parallels, *by Alexander Heidel* 76
The Chinese Constitution, *by Pan Wei-Tung* 77
After Black Coffee, *by Robert I. Gannon, S.J.* 78
Collected Papers of Evelyn Underhill, *Edited by Lucy Menzines* 79

BOOK NOTES 80

CHANGE OF ADDRESS

We Solicit Your Co-operation

Notice of change of address should be sent to us promptly, and at the same time the old address should be given.

Sometimes a subscriber overlooks reporting change of address; and now and then a subscriber dies, and in either case his copy continues to be sent to his former address. In such cases notification from Successor or Pastor would be appreciated.

You May Use the Blank Below:

NAME: .....

OLD ADDRESS: .....

NEW ADDRESS: .....

OTHER INFORMATION: .....

The American Ecclesiastical Review
The Catholic University of America
Washington 17, D. C.

"PRAYER AND WORK": AN ANCIENT FORMULA FOR A MODERN CRISIS

Among the most widely mourned losses of the war now happily ended was the destruction of the Abbey and the Basilica of Monte Cassino, one of the most revered shrines in Christendom, a beacon light of the faith throughout fourteen centuries and the cradle of western monasticism. Founded by St. Benedict, the patriarch of monks, it was there that he died in the year 547 after having written his Holy Rule, the prototype of all rules for monks and religious in the Western Church. Situated as it was on the very top of one of the lofty mountains midway between Rome and Naples, the abbey seemed as inaccessible as an eagle's nest, so secure, so severely elevated and apart. The poet Longfellow describes it:

> "And there uplifted like a passing cloud
> That pauses on a mountain summit high
> Monte Cassino's Convent rears it proud
> And venerable walls against the sky."

It seemed a symbol of dedication to God and its resultant peace. Looking up to it one could well understand the origin of the Benedictine tradition embodied in the proverb: "Benedictus montes amabat"—"Benedict loved the mountains." The very buildings seemed to preach St. Paul's text: "Seek ye the things that are above."

The material grandeur which centuries of devotion has dedicated as a visible monument to a spiritual reality is destroyed. It had happened before. In fact, Monte Cassino's motto inscribed on its coat of arms: "Succisa virescit"—"Though cut down, it grows again," not only spurs on the monks in their work of reconstruction but becomes an incentive for us in the reconstruction of the world of our day. Because that spiritual reality still vibrantly lives in the Rule of St. Benedict, our own age can find the solution to its problems by a study and application of his principles, well-tested and well-functioning after fourteen centuries.

These words coming from me, a son of St. Benedict, might sound prejudiced and presumptuous—("Cicero pro domo sua"). I am merely paraphrasing, however, the words of our Holy Father, Pope Pius XII, in his most recent encyclical letter: *Fulgens radiatur* ("Brilliantly Shines"). Published on March 21, the feast day of

St. Benedict, in commemoration of the fourteen hundredth anniversary of his death, the letter urges Christian people to pattern their lives upon the principles of religion as exemplified by St. Benedict in his life and Rule. He likens St. Benedict to "a star in the darkness of the night," brightly shining, which for centuries kept alive the flame of Christian culture for all men to see, and seeing, to take heart. Nor does the Holy Father hesitate to suggest that all classes of society will find inspiration and comfort from St. Benedict in our day, because:

> . . . all classes of society, if they studiously and seriously examine the life, teaching and glorious achievements of St. Benedict, cannot but fall under the influence of his gentle but powerful inspiration; indeed they will spontaneously recognize that even our age, troubled and anxious because of the vast material and moral ruins, perils and losses that have been heaped up, can borrow from him the needed remedies.
>
> St. Benedict proved the perennial youth of the Church by his outstanding sanctity and work; he restored morality by his teaching and example; he protected the sanctuary of religious life with safer and holier laws. Nor was that all. He and his followers reclaimed the uncultivated tribes from their barbaric life to civic and Christian culture, directing them to the practice of virtue, industry and the peaceful arts and literature. He united them in the bonds of fraternal affection and charity.

And again: "If these norms of St. Benedict which once illumined, saved and reconstructed the crumbling society of those turbulent times and even led it back to better ways would be accepted and honored universally today, then, no doubt, our age will be able to salvage itself from its terrifying shipwreck, make up its losses material and spiritual, and adequately remedy its deep wounds."

Here our Supreme Pontiff, in outlining a program for the post-war world, draws an extended parallel between the age in which St. Benedict lived and our own age, and prescribes St. Benedict's principles as basic in the renovation and re-Christianization of the modern world. Benedictine life is family life whose members vow stability to the monastic family of their profession. By prayer and work *(ora et labora)* the monk accomplishes the highest purposes of man's existence, namely the praise of God and the love of neighbor.

St. Benedict gives priority to prayer, to community or family prayer, which he calls the *opus Dei* or work of God. Of seventy-

three chapters which comprise his Holy Rule, sixteen are concerned with this most important daily monastic duty. Just as the Church Universal is "The family of God" (cf. Collects of Fifth Sunday after Epiphany, Twenty-first Sunday after Pentecost, the sacred Triduum; cf. also *Ephes.* 2:19, "You belong to God's household"), so too every Benedictine monastery is the family of God on a smaller scale, the Church of God in miniature. It was of the genius of St. Benedict, a true Roman, to have conceived Christian life in its simplest form and outline—that of the family—and *only* then to have given it a rule based, as we have seen, on prayer and work, which would insure its permanency. He was not legislating for a world-wide organization or society but for individual monastic family units. And that is why, despite the downfall of the Roman Empire and its highly centralized organization, the monasteries were able to hand over to the invading barbarian peoples Christianity in its simplest yet fully adequate because fundamental form—that of Christian family life. That is one of the contributions of St. Benedict to our western civilization. Precisely because it has proved eminently practical and successful in the past does our present Holy Father recommend its application and universal scale in our present day. Certainly nothing is more needed at this time than these working models of Christian life as established by St. Benedict ("little spiritual republics," a writer of our day has called them) which exemplify the solidity and permanency of human relations in their most elemental form, the family. In his role as Vicar of Christ and the Supreme Pastor of Men, Pope Pius XII appeals to all peoples and nations to form one Christian family, united as brothers in Christ in common love and common work, joined together inseparably with Christ in the prayer and worship of their common Father.

A crass and materialistic interpretation of the traditionally sacred and religious concept of brotherhood has robbed it of its exalted and spiritual character. The purveyors of totalitarianism have degraded it for their own purposes into the mere mass association of men working for their masters, the all-powerful State. In actual truth and reality, man is a brother to his fellow man only because of the image of God, common to both in their creation by a common Father. There can be no union in the mere material massing together of men. "It is the Spirit which gives life" *(John* 6:64); which gives liberty *(II Cor.* 3:17); which gives sonship with God

whereby, alone, we are privileged to cry: "Abba—Father" *(Rom.* 8:15).

It is of this spiritual brotherhood of all men living as one family, under one common Father, that Pope Pius XII speaks:

> There is another lesson and admonition by the Holy Patriarch, Benedict, of which our age stands so much in need, namely, that God is not only to be honored and adored but to be loved as a Father . . . Since the Eternal Father is the author of life and from Him we have received numerous gifts, it is our strict duty to love Him ardently and to direct and give ourselves and all we have to Him. From this divine love, fraternal charity towards our neighbor should arise which will lead us to embrace all men of whatever race, nation, or culture, as our brothers in Christ. Thus from all nations and from all levels of society there will arise a single Christian family whose members will not be divided by exaggerated personal interests but will harmoniously work together for the good of the whole.

States and nations are groups of families. If instability and insecurity characterize modern society and all its forms, the solution lies, not in extending the man-made powers of the already overly-powerful state, but in a restoration of those values rooted in family life and God-given; namely the dignity of the human person and the recognition of man's right to work. In work and prayer man exercises and enjoys these rights. St. Benedict combines them so well in his Rule and in the daily lives of his monks that the one serves as a stimulus and a preparation for the other, flowing out from and entering into the other, bringing about by their intimate and harmonious penetration and union that peace which has been his legacy to his followers.

It is to the bulwarks of the home and family life that our legislators and sociologists might better address themselves and with more profit than by academically discussing peace pacts, international security and atomic insecurity. Christ's words to the leaders of His day may well be addressed to those of our own; "You know how to read the face of the sky, but cannot read the signs of the times." The solution is simple and radical because it goes back to the origin of life and of society, again—the family.

It is principally to the subject of labor and man's rights, to the fruits of his labor, that Communism appeals. Although in actual practice as imposed by the Communist State, men are slaves, yet the fact that the State does provide work for all and thus, in almost

a travesty of so holy a thing, also the right for all to work, the propoganda can be attractive to those peoples who hopelessly and helplessly wait for work and bread. In direct opposition to this special appeal, the Holy Father summarizes and evaluates St. Benedict's contribution to the Christian concept of labor in the following words:

> . . . the author and lawgiver of the Benedictine Order has another lesson for us, which is, indeed, freely and widely proclaimed today but far too often not properly reduced to practice as it should be. It is that human labor is not without dignity: it is not a distasteful and burdensome thing, but rather something to be esteemed, an honor and a joy. A busy life, whether employed in the fields, in the profitable trades, or in the liberal arts, does not demean the mind but elevates it; does not reduce it to slavery, but more truly gives it a certain mastery and power of direction over even the most difficult circumstances. Even Jesus, as a youth, still sheltered within the domestic walls, did not disdain to ply the carpenter's trade in his foster-father's workshop; He wished to consecrate human toil with divine sweat.
>
> Let those, therefore, who labor in trades as well as those who are busy in the pursuit of literature and learning remember that they are performing a most noble task in winning their daily bread; they are not only providing for themselves and their best interests but can be of service to the entire community. Let them toil as the Patriarch Benedict admonishes, with mind and soul elevated toward heaven, working not by compulsion but through love . . .

It is impossible not to associate the Holy Father's encyclical on St. Benedict with his overwhelming preoccupation with the deep-rooted and widespread establishment of Communism throughout the western world and, particularly, with its rampant progress in his own beloved Italy and Rome. It is as though the Father of Christendom, seeing the millions of his children turning toward the Red Star of Communism, points out another Star "brilliantly shining" *(Fulgens radiatur)* in the darkness of the night, St. Benedict, and proclaims: "Here is the true guide and Patron of man's brotherhood and the common life; here is the legislator of labor and the dispenser of its fruits; here in his Rule is a Bill of Rights establishing your dignity, not merely as men, but elevating you to that infinitely higher plane of freedom of the sons of God whereon your work becomes a prayer and your prayer-work becomes fruitful even unto life everlasting."

No more suitable summary of the Encyclical, whether of its content or purpose, could be given than that found in the prayer which the Church offers to God in honor of St. Benedict:

"Arouse within Thy Church, O Lord, the Spirit which possessed our holy Father St. Benedict that, being filled with the same Spirit, we too may strive to love what he loved and to put into practice what he taught. Through Christ, our Lord. Amen."

ABBOT PATRICK M. O'BRIEN, O.S.B.

Saint Mary's Abbey,
Newark, N. J.

FIFTY YEARS AGO

In the July, 1897, issue of *The American Ecclesiastical Review* the leading article is a very inspiring treatment of "The Religious State and Modern Society." The significance and the value of the vow of poverty particularly is developed with great clarity and logic. It is tragic to realize that the author was the unfortunate George Tyrrell, S.J. . . . The beginning of a series of articles on the North American College in Rome, by a certain "Quirinus, D.D.," presents a brief history of the venerable building, dating from the early years of the seventeenth century, and a description of the college chapel. . . . Fr. T. Hughes, S.J., continuing his comments on Dr. White's "Warfare of Science with Theology," exposes the sophistry and inaccuracy of the latter's attack on the miracles ascribed to St. Francis Xavier. . . . An instructive "Ecclesiastical Chronology," embracing the main events of the past six months in Church circles, contains such interesting items as the granting of permission by the Secretary of War for the erection of a Catholic chapel at West Point and, a month later, the revocation of this permission by the Attorney-General. (The permission was finally obtained through the efforts of Msgr. Cornelius O'Keefe, pastor of Highland Falls.) . . . . In the *Analecta* we find the Latin text of the Encyclical of Pope Leo XIII, *Divinum illud,* treating of the operation of the Holy Ghost in the Church. . . . An anonymous writer takes exception to Bishop McQuaid's suggestion that there be maid-servants in seminaries to make up the students' rooms and to act as waitresses. . . . One of the book reviews is devoted to the first edition of the *Manual of the Holy Eucharist,* by the prolific writer, Fr. F. X. Lasance.

F.J.C.

PRE-COLUMBIAN DEVOTION TO MARY IN AMERICA: THE TESTIMONY OF THE KENSINGTON STONE

The advent of Christianity on our present American continent antedates the discovery of Columbus by almost five centuries. The story of the Norsemen (Northmen, Norse, Nordics, Normans) is well known to every boy and girl of high-school age, and is confirmed by Vatican archival material.[1] The period of their greatest activities lies between the tenth and the eleventh centuries. Seeking the articles necessary for their existence and culture which they did not find in their cold Scandinavian countries, they sent out roving hordes of warriors and colonists who ravished the shores of Ireland, France, England, Spain, Northern Africa, Italy, Sicily, Greece.

In 841 a band of Norsemen under Oscar made an expedition up the Seine River to Rouen, which they burned and pillaged. Successive inroads into the country, now known after their conquests as Normandy, followed. Nantes was attacked in 843 and only a few years later Paris, which was able to withstand the raids only through the courage of Robert, the Strong, the founder of the Houses of Capet. Bit by bit the Norman extended their conquests, settling as a rule on the mouths of rivers for protection and an easy departure in case of attack. In or about 911, Charles III, surnamed the Simple, King of the Franks, granted to the Norman leader Rollo a portion of territory in Neustria centering around the city of Rouen. Other portions of the later Normandy were acquired in 924 and 933 and the land was colonized by a constant influx of Normans from Denmark, Norway and Sweden. "The Normans were powerfully influenced by the French language, religion, and customs, and, as in every land to which they came as conquerors, they adapted themselves to the conquered land and gradually became identified with it."[2] By the eleventh century the Normans had adopted the French law, the French language and the Christian religion.

[1] Cf. *Cath. Encyc.* XI, 115 ff.; Charles Morris, *Heroes of Discovery in America* (Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1906), pp. 9 ff. *The Flatey Book and Recently Discovered Vatican Manuscripts concerning America as early as the Tenth Century* (Norroena Society, 1906); Olsen-Bourne, *The Northmen, Columbus and Cabot: 985-1503* (New York: Scribners, 1906).

[2] *Columbia Encyc.* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1935), p. 1276.

In 1066 one of the Dukes of Normandy, William the Conqueror, overcame the Saxons of England (the Norman conquest) and introduced Norman culture and architecture into England. Since the religion of the Normans and of the Anglo-Saxons was Catholic the two nations were, comparatively speaking, easily amalgamated. By Chaucer's time (1340-1400) even their languages had been interwoven and their kings, with few exceptions due to investiture troubles, were loyal to the See of Rome. All this has a deep bearing on what is to follow.

Naturally, the Norsemen still living in Scandinavia exchanged visits with the peoples or colonists of the lands their countrymen had conquered and soon the religion of France and of England became the religion of Scandinavia.

Besides, in the ninth century St. Anscar (801-865), a monk of Corbie, near Amiens, was sent by Louis, King of the Franks, to Denmark, where he converted King Harold, and to Sweden, where he converted King Olaf (Oscar). In 864 Anscar became bishop of the united dioceses of Hamburg and Bremen and spent the rest of his episcopal career in spreading the Gospel in these nordic lands. This too is important for our story.

By the year 1000 (the year of the Norsemen's expedition to America) bands of Normans had already settled in southern Italy and, due to their valor and boldness, were hired and paid to free the citizens of Salerno from their Arab captors. In 1042 the sons of Tancred de Hauteville, a great Norman adventurer, seized Apulia, divided it into countships, and held it against the attacks of Italians, Germans and the forces of Pope Leo IX (1049-54). In 1053 this saintly pope was obliged to grant to them, as a fief of the church, Apulia and Calabria. By 1071 all southern Italy was under the control of the Normans. Due to their fealty and loyalty, the great Pope Gregory VII (1073-85) called on them to assist him in his struggles against the notorious German King, Henry IV. The Normans sacked Rome in 1084, and drove out the German invaders.[3]

These were the men whose blood by the middle of the thirteenth century flowed in the veins of Scandinavians, Franks, Englishmen,

[3] On that occasion the church of *San Clemente* (later in charge of the Irish Dominicans and titular church of the late William Cardinal O'Connell of Boston) was razed to the ground.

Italians, and Sicilians. Their conquests, like their culture, have left indelible marks all over Europe. Norman architecture may still be seen in the crypts of Canterbury and of Westminster.

These same Norsemen (Normans) not only made their way south and east; they also pushed their way westward. Long before the year 1000 the Norse had their outposts in the islands of the North Atlantic: in the Orkneys (north-east of Scotland); in the Shetlands (north of the Orkneys), and in the Faroes (between Norway and Iceland).[4] By 784 the Norse had already reached Iceland, where very soon they had a population of fifty thousand (many of them of Irish descent) and set up a republic (930-1263) bound to Norway, the mother-land, only by slender allegiance. In 1263 Iceland came under the rule of King Haakon IV, and both (Iceland and Norway) passed under the rule of Denmark in 1381. Shortly thereafter, in virtue of the Treaty of Kalmar (1397), Margaret of Denmark (1353-1412) became Queen of Denmark, Norway and Sweden. In 1363 she had married Haakon VI, son of King Magnus Erickson. This date too is important for our study.

Mention was made above of Norman culture. Long before England, France, Italy, and Spain had come into possession of their present languages, a rich Icelandic literature had sprung up. The historic records of Iceland, incorporated into their sagas, are unequalled by anything in modern times. And no one must compare the sagas of Iceland with mere fairy tales of folk-lore. They are real epics of a great nation.

From Iceland the Norsemen moved westward to Greenland, which they discovered at the end of the ninth century, had colonized by the end of the tenth, and Christianized by the beginning of the eleventh.[5]

Obliged to flee Norway because of manslaughter, one Eric Thornwaldsson, familiarly known as Eric, the Red, came to Iceland. But there too, in another brawl, he slew a man and fled, sailing westward until he came to the island of Greenland, the second largest in the world (next to Australia), in 985. Many colonists from Iceland, some of whom might have been of Irish descent,[6]

[4] Cf. *Cath Encyc.*, XI, 116.

[5] Cf. *ibid.*, VI, 778.

[6] Cf. Maynard, *The Story of American Catholicism* (New York: Macmilan, 1941), p. 4. Between the northern tip of Ireland, which lies on the 55°

came to Greenland, where they founded settlements. In 986, according to the Flatey Book, Biarni Heriulfson, driven out of his course by storms, sighted a strange country to the south (Vinland), on the shores of which, however, he did not land.[7]

On a visit to Norway in 999, Eric's son, Lief Ericson, the Happy (Herni),[8] and his wife Theohild were won over to Christianity by King Olaf Trygvasson (the saintly king of Norway: 1016-30) who gave him some missionaries to accompany him back to his home country (Greenland) with the charge to disseminate there the Gospel of Christ. In a remarkably short time these missionaries succeeded in converting the Norse colonists, at least outwardly, and in establishing in Greenland an organized church. Sixteen parishes were eventually and successively founded, also three Benedictine monasteries, one of them for nuns. As the distance from Europe made communication very difficult, Greenland, in spite of its small number of souls, was formed into the diocese of Gardar.[9] In the beginning, the new diocese was suffragan to the Archbishop of Hamburg-Bremen (Bishop Adam of Bremen, successor of St. Anscar); later to the Archbishop of Lund, Norway, and ultimately to the Archbishop of Trondhjem (Trondheim or Drondtheim) Norway.[10]

According to Gams[11] and Eubel[12] the first bishop of Gardar, Eric

---

of latitude and the center of Iceland, through the middle of which the 35° of latitude passes, there are 20° of latitude distance, or approximately 550 miles. "The ancient Irish were a seafaring people, closely related to the Phoenicians. In 296, they invaded Denmark and in the following century menaced England and met the Roman conqueror. They visited the northern coasts of Scotland and the Faroe and Orkney Islands. In the ninth century when the Northmen came to Iceland they found relics of the former settlers; books, bells, croziers, souvenirs of the occupation by the Irish monks and their followers." Thomas P. Phelan, *Catholics in Colonial Days* (New York: Kenedy, 1935), p. 9.

[7] Cf. *Catholic Historical Review (CHR),* (1927), p. 591.

[8] Cf. *Encyc. Brit.,* XIII, 892 (1944).

[9] Gardar was named after a Danish explorer, of Swedish descent, who had landed in Iceland in 860.

[10] The Diocese of Trondheim was established in 1029.

[11] Cf. J. B. Gams, O.S.B., *Series episcoporum ecclesiae catholicae* (Ratisbon, 1875).

[12] Cf. Conrad Eubel, O.F.M.Conv., *Hierarchia catholica medii aevi* (2 vols., Münster, 1898).

Gnupson (or Upsi) was appointed in 1112 by Pope Paschal II (1099-1118); the last one was appointed by Pope Innocent VIII (1484-92), and confirmed by Pope Alexander VI (1492-1503) in 1492, the very year that Columbus discovered America. Sixteen to eighteen bishops of various nationalities occupied the see of Gardar.[13] Between 1409 and 1492 there are frequent interruptions in the series, bishops perhaps having been appointed by Rome, but some of them either never leaving for their posts or unable to reach their destination.

While the church in Greenland was thus developing, a country to the south-west was discovered, which for hundreds of years was not only frequently visited but also actually inhabited for periods of two to three years at a time by traders and missionaries as well from Greenland as from Iceland. In Icelandic annals it is known as Vinland, the Good.[14]

Authorities today are willing to concede that this Vinland was none other than the American continent, and it has all but been demonstrated that it was on the New England coast.[15] The discoverer of Vinland was the above-named Leif Ericson, the Catholic convert, who, taking advantage of the news brought back by Biarni Heriulfson that land existed south-west of Greenland, bought Biarni's ship, collected a crew of thirty-five men, and sailed to explore a new country. At first he found the new region stony with ice-covered mountains; this he called Helluland (Flat Stone Land). Then, sailing southward, he found sandy shores and wooded hills; these he named Markland (Forestland). Later he came to a pleasant coast (probably off Cape Cod), and this he called Vinland (Wineland).[16] To commemorate his great discovery Boston has erected a statue to the memory of Leif Ericson. It is not improbable that one or the other Catholic missionary, whom Leif received from King Olaf, accompanied him also on his first voyage to Vin-

[13] Cf. Peter Guilday, *History of the Councils of Baltimore: 1791-1884* (New York: Macmillan, 1932), p. 19.

[14] Vinland or Wineland derives its name from the wild grapes which Lief Ericson found there. Wheat was also discovered. The winters, by contrast with those in Iceland and Greenland, were mild.

[15] It is sometimes located at Passamaquoddy Bay, where wild grapes abound. For other ideas cf. *Encyc. Brit.* XXIII, 173.

[16] Cf. Phelan, *op. cit.*, pp. 9 f. Maynard, *op. cit.*, p. 6; *CHR*, VII (1927), 591.

land; also Leif's brother Thorawald, who spent three winters in the new land; and possibly also Thorfinn Karlsefni (about 1004)[17] and his wife, who attempted to make a settlement, but who were attacked by hostile natives. During his sojourn Thorfinn's wife gave birth to a son, Snorre Karsefne.

Unfortunately, whereas in Greenland ruins of churches, monasteries, and homes of the Scandinavian settlers are to be found, and in Iceland relics of the early Irish settlers,[18] in Vinland proper (the north Atlantic coast) no unchallenged trace of Christian buildings or settlements have been discovered. The archeological proof is thus indeed wanting. The old "mill" (?) at Newport, R. I., the Dighton Rock on the Taunton River, and the remains of Norumbega (an old Norse or Indian city) on the Charles River[19] are not definitely admitted by serious historians to be vestiges of the Norse discovery of America.

THE KENSINGTON STONE

A somewhat different aspect however is taken, toward the "Kensington Stone," which, written in runic (old Gothic) characters and containing religious sentiments, was discovered near the town of Kensington in Minnesota in 1898 and dates, according to the inscription, from 1362.[20] The inscription as translated reads:

> 8 Goths [Swedes] and 22 Norwegians on [an] exploring journey from Vinland very far West. We had a camp near 2 skerries [rocks in the water] on [a] day's journey north from this stone. We were [out] fishing one day. When we returned home [we] found 10 men red with blood and dead. AVM [*Ave Maria,* or *Ave Virgo Maria*]. Save [us] from evil.
>
> [We] have 10 men by the sea to look after our vessel 14 [41] days journey from this island. Year 1362.

---

[17] Cf. *Encyc. Brit.,* XXIII, 173.

[18] Cf. Phelan, *op. cit.,* p. 4.

[19] Cf. *Encyc. Americana,* XX, 435 f.

[20] Concerning the "Kensington Stone" cf. Hjalmar R. Holand, *The Kensington Stone* (Ephraim, Wisconsin: 1932); *Westward from Vinland* (New York: Duell, Sloan and Pearce, 1940); *America: 1355-1364* (New York: Duell, Sloan and Pearce, 1946). Professor Holand is a firm believer in the authenticity of the Kensington Stone and has repudiated with scholarly serenity and with weighty arguments all his opponents. Cf. also Maynard *op. cit.* p. 9; and C. Stewart Peterson, *America's Rune Stone of A.D. 1362 Gains Favor* (New York: Hobson Book Press, 1946).

From this inscription we gather that thirty Swedish and Norwegian explorers came to the central part of what is now Minnesota (most probably by water over the Great Lakes and other waterways) on a journey of exploration made in 1362. Their starting point was Vinland. They put up a camp near a lake, at the point of which were found two rocks (or islets) in the water, the camping place being about a day's journey to the north from the spot where the stone was found. One day they went fishing on the lake; but when they returned to their camp, they found that ten of their men had been killed by the savages. Thereupon they packed up their belongings and departed in all haste, at first in a southerly direction. After having travelled for about a day, they rested on an island, where they carved into a stone the record of their journey and addressed a prayer to the Blessed Virgin Mary to save them from further evil. Their ship was left by the sea in the custody of 10 men, at a distance of about fourteen days' journey. (The rendering of the numerals indicating the distance to their ship is not altogether certain; it might mean fourteen or forty-one days. However, forty-one, thinks Fr. Schaefer, seems to be more probable.)[21]

If genuine, and the best authorities favor its authenticity, the Kensington Stone is about the only documentary permanent monument to prove definitely the existence of pre-Columbian Christian explorers in the present United States, west of Vinland, and their devotion to Mary, the Mother of God, in a pre-Columbian period. For to whom would these Christian Norsemen in their hour of sorrow, when they saw ten of their crew murdered by Mandan Indians, take refuge and pray, rather than to Mary, the Sorrowful Mother, whose initials they inscribed on the epitaph to their deceased comrades? There is nothing strange or unwarranted in this.

RELIGIOUS CORROBORATION

In 1362 the popes were living at Avignon. There were two popes occupying the Fisherman's Throne in that year: Innocent VI, who died on Sept. 12, 1362, and Urban V, who was enthroned as pope on Nov. 6th. Due to the fishing episode just narrated—as recorded on the Kensington Stone—which most probably occurred during the summer time or fall, the Bishop of Rome at the time

[21] Cf. *CHR* (1920), p. 332.

would have been, it seems most probable to assume, Innocent VI (1352-62).

By the middle of the fourteenth century the spread of Christianity to distant lands was no longer a novelty. Throughout the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries Dominicans, Franciscans, and other religious missionaries had already evangelized Asia, Africa, and far-off Mongolia and China (Cathay). John of Monte Corvino (†1328) had already founded, with the approval of Rome, the first diocese of Peiping, of which he became the first bishop. John de Piano di Carpini (†1252) had already made his voyage through Poland and southern Russia to Asia to visit the Grand Khan at Karakorum and left a written account of his long missionary journeys. William Rubruck († after 1256) had already, a whole century before the date of our episode in Minnesota, drawn most glowing pictures of the wealth of Asia, which attracted the attention of sea-faring Venetians and Genoese to the east, already inspired by the marvelous accounts of Marco Polo and the Zeno Brothers. Oderic of Pardenone had by the beginning of the fourteenth century brought back to Pope John XXII (1316-34), a predecessor of Innocent VI at Avignon, an inspiring report of his travels to Tibet, Persia, and the Far-East. By 1331, Bl. Oderic of Pardenone had already returned to Avignon to give a report of his missionary activities in Mongolia and China to the same Pope John XXII. What these men were doing for the propogation of the Faith overland, others, including members of the secular clergy, (bishops, nuncios, etc.) were doing overseas. The year 1362, inscribed on the Kensington Stone, marks then the period of one of the fruitful activities of the Church in foreign lands.

The devotion to the Blessed Virgin Mary too, by that time, had been universal in all Christianity. The beautiful homilies of St. Augustine and St. Ambrose and the sermons of St. John Damascene and of St. Bernard of Clairvaux on Mary had already been inserted into the Roman Breviary and were known to every priest of the Middle Ages. The Scholastics too had already sung the praises of the blessed Virgin Mary in their commentaries on the works of Peter of Lombardy or in their own *summae*. The beautiful antiphons and hymns to the Blessed Mother of Christ were being chanted in the churches and in the monastery chapels day in and day out, especially on Saturdays, already then dedicated to Mary in honor of her sorrows consequent on the first Good Friday. St.

Anthony of Padua, a whole century before, had composed sermons which were in circulation in honor of the four principal feast-days of the Blessed Virgin celebrated throughout Christianity: Mary's Nativity (Sept. 8); her Annunciation (March 25); her Purification (Feb. 2); and her Assumption into Heaven (Aug. 15). By 1362 St. Dominic and his zealous friars of the Order of Preachers had already spread over Europe and elsewhere the devotion to the Rosary. St. Francis of Assisi and his followers and devotees were popularizing the Portiuncula Indulgence obtained at the request of Mary, the Queen of Angels. The Carmelites had already organized confraternities of the Scapular all over the Christian world. The Servites were encouraging the devotion to the Sorrowful Mother, even as in our own day. The Mercedari and Trinitarians, dedicated to the honor of Mary, were offering themselves as hostages to Saracen leaders in Africa and Moorish Spain for the deliverance of Christian captives. Ever since 1294 all Christianity was making pilgrimages to Loretto, and even before that time to other shrines of the Blessed Mother throughout Europe, including the lands which the Norsemen had founded or conquered. An invocation then to Mary in 1362 by Christian men in distress in America was as natural as even in our own days the recitation of the *Ave Maria.*

HISTORICAL DOCUMENTATION

To round out our story there remains but one point to clarify: the occasion of the expedition of the Norsemen to Vinland in 1362 and even to far-off Minnesota. Following the painstaking researches of Dr. Hjalmar R. Holand, of the University of Minnesota, even this can now be easily accounted for. In a document dated Oct. 28 ("the Monday after Simon and Judah's day"), 1354, "Magnus by the grace of God, King of Norway, Sweden and Skaane" (special provinces of ancient Sweden) despatched one Paul Knutson with a crew of men "for the honor of God and for the sake of our soul and for the sake of our predecessors, who in Greenland established Christianity and have maintained it to this time," to that far-off outpost of his realm to look after the affairs of Christianity and of Christ's Church.[22] Knutson's expedition lasted from 1355 to 1364.

[22] A copy of this document by King Magnus Ericson, dating from about the year 1600, is still retained in the Royal Library of Copenhagen, and was

That Greenland during King Magnus II's reign (1322-63) had been lapsing in its practice of Christianity is attested by other events, all of which confirm the wisdom of the worry of King Magnus concerning the possible total lapse of Christianity in his distant Atlantic possessions. The "Black Death" of 1348 which had decimated cities of all Europe, including the British Isles, must have made itself felt also in Greenland.[23] Added to this dreaded epidemic came the danger of possible extermination of the Greenlanders by the Skraellings (American Indians) with whom they had repeatedly come into contact during their many expeditions to Vinland. The northern Indian tribes were being harassed by the more numerous and more cultured bands of Indians coming from the south, the present American red man to whom in course of time they had to yield. The Skraellings (now represented by the Eskimos of Greenland) sought protection in northern climes—i.e., in Greenland. Most authors are of the opinion that the Skraellings, even as the Eskimos today, were friendly to the Greenlanders—they undoubtedly had repeatedly assisted them and traded with them while they were felling the trees and getting their cargoes ready for the homeland, for there was no native lumber in Greenland, but there was much of it, as the sagas narrate, in Vinland. But there was still danger that perhaps the southern Indians might still pursue the Skraellings and harass them even in Greenland. Furthermore, ecclesiastical authorities and annalists like Eubel, Gams, and Storn,[24] as well as others, state that the diocese of Gardar had been vacant for nineteen years, until the consecration of Bishop Alf in 1368. There was no bishop, then, in Greenland in 1354 (the date of King

---

seen by the reviewer of Dr. Holand's *Westward from Vinland,* Mr. Philip Ainsworth Means (cf. *The New York Times Book Review* of May 26, 1940, p. 9). "Though late (about 1600)," says the reviewer, "it is old enough to prove that Mr. Holand did not fabricate it, as some half-mad opponent of the inscription has charged." An English version of the document appears both in Dr. Holand's cited book and in C. Stewart Peterson's *America's Rune Stone of A.D. 1362 Gains Favor.*

[23] Cf. Rev. Thomas O'Gorman (at one time Professor of Church History at the Catholic University of America and later Bishop of Sioux Falls), *A History of the Roman Catholic Church in the United States* (New York: The Christian Literature Co., 1895), p. 8.

[24] Cf. *Islanske Annaler, anno 1368.*

Magnus' document) for Alf's predecessor had died in 1349,[25] perhaps a victim of the afore-mentioned plague. All this, plus the lack of regular communication with his Island possession, due to the Black Death—and perhaps also to ice floes which had been closing in on Greenland and separating it from the rest of civilization—naturally caused good King Magnus to be concerned; hence the *raison d'être* of the Knutson expedition.[26]

RELIGIOUS SIGNIFICANCE

That the expedition went beyond Greenland and even "westward from Vinland" (which accounts for its long delay in returning to Norway) is attested by the inscription on the Kensington Stone: "on an exploring journey from Vinland." Just why Knutson and his men—perhaps accompanied also by Greenlanders as seems rather plausible—went westward is anybody's conjecture, and yet a possible reason lies close at hand. They were Vikings like their forefathers, and *wanderlust* must also have run in their veins. They had heard of Vinland from the sagas of their poets; their countrymen in Greenland too had told them of their own exploits to the new country lying to the west. What was more natural for these fearless sea-faring men, with the knowledge of the deeds of their Norman ancestors fresh in their memories, and the same blood flowing in their veins, to extend their course as far west as possible. Furthermore, might it not be possible that just at the time of their arrival in Vinland Greenlanders were also there, felling trees, loading their cargoes, or perhaps even taking advantage of the fall season of the year,[27] to collect grapes to take home for the making of wine?

The fact that there were eight Goths and twenty-two Nor-

[25] Cf. *CHR* (1925), p. 205.

[26] To confirm this lack of intercourse with Greenland we might refer to a curious entry in the Icelandic annals of 1368, only a few years later, which states: "A ship came from Greenland to Norway which had lain in the former country two whole years." The men who returned by this ship brought news from Greenland of Bishop Alf's death which had taken place there "six years before" (O'Gorman, *op. cit.* p. 8). According to this entry then, there had been no communication between the two countries for six years. If that happened in 1368, there must have been similar reasons for misgivings just before King Magnus sent out his expedition in 1355.

[27] Cf. *supra* what was said concerning their fishing episode.

wegians in Minnesota on the expedition is also most coherent with the decree of King Magnus. Goths and Swedes alike were his subjects. The Goths lived in Gothland in southwestern Sweden. The Swedish people living there in 1362 were still known as Goths and were referred to by that name as late as 1500.[28]

Did a Catholic priest accompany the Knutson expedition? Listen to these significant words of C. Stewart Peterson of the Library of Congress in his book published only last year: *America's Rune Stone of A. D. 1362 Gains Favor:*

> In the Kensington inscription we find the sacred letters A V M indicating that one or more priests were in the expedition. That men of this type were along, who were learned in Latin and Runes, is to be expected since the professed initial purpose of the whole expedition was to maintain and strengthen Christianity in Greenland.[29]

The Latin letters AVM among the runic characters on the Kensington Stone is thus easily explained. But even if there were no priests among the expedition, every school child then, as now, of Catholic faith must have known the meaning of the words *Ave Maria* as well as they knew how to say "Good morning" in their native tongues. The inscription AVM too was to be found everywhere in Catholic churches.

If good King Olaf as far back as the year 1000 (or thereabouts) had sent priests with Leif Ericson, after his conversion in Norway, to Greenland to evangelize the natives there, can there be any possible doubt about King Magnus, Olaf's successor, three hundred and fifty years later (1362), doing the same, especially since he was set to preserve the Faith "for the sake of our predecessors who in Greenland established Christianity and have maintained it to this time?"[30] And if there were priests on the Knutson expedition to Minnesota would one be exposing himself to the ridiculous by surmising that perhaps the chaplain (or chaplains) of the journey also celebrated Mass on these our shores in the fourteenth century? Would "Vinland, the Good" (in the present

[28] C. Stewart Peterson, *America's Rune Stone . . .*, p. 65.

[29] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 68.

[30] For King Magnus' letter to his royal favorite, Paul Knutson, cf. *ibid.*, p. 67.

Archdiocese of Boston) have furnished the wheat and the wine for the first Mass celebrated in our present U.S.A.?

THE GENUINENESS OF THE KENSINGTON STONE

But, could not the Kensington Stone, as asserted of the Newport Tower and other alleged pre-Columbian antiquities, be a fraud and bear no relation whatsoever to the Knutson expedition? Mr. Peterson, Professor Holand, Dr. James J. Walsh, Msgr. Francis J. Schaefer, and scores of other archeologists and historians do not think so; in fact the more the authenticity of the stone is impugned, the stronger the belief in it grows. Mr. Peterson says on the point:

> After about half a century of scholarly controversial discussions and intensive research the Kensington Rune Stone is gaining favor among those who believe in its genuineness. With the passing of the years more and more among the archeologists, geologists, and antiquarians are beginning to accept the Kensington Stone with its runic message as the oldest document written by white men in North America on American History.[31]

The assumption that certain Scandinavians of the Minnesota sector might have fabricated the stone is not only highly improbable but demands a greater amount of credulity than the acceptance of its authenticity. The Kensington Stone was found in 1898 by one Olaf Ohman, a farmer, while clearing his woodland. He found the stone under an aspen tree, the roots of which had after many years of natural growth fastened themselves tightly against the surface of the stone and completely surrounded it. Since the stone is six inches thick, sixteen inches wide and thirty-one inches long, and weighs two hundred pounds, experienced research scholars accept this fact as proof that the stone was there since the beginning of the growth of the aspen tree, probably some seventy years prior to the finding of the stone, dating back therefore to about 1830. Scandinavians did not permanently settle in Minnesota until 1868. The few trappers and land speculators who passed through would hardly have considered it profitable and worth while to chisel out a fake runic inscription on a stone found tightly surrounded by roots under a tree some seventy years old.

[31] *Op. cit.* p. 76.

The following words of Mr. Peterson also are very significant:

> Protestant Scandinavians of the nineteenth century or about 1830 would hardly have inscribed the invocation of the Blessed Virgin Mary found on this runic stone. This, it would seem, definitely places the date of the runic inscription back before the Protestant Reformation which began about a century and a half after 1362, the date found on the stone.[32]

In other words, why would Protestant Scandinavian farmers during the middle of the nineteenth century fake a stone with the invocation to the Blessed Virgin Mary on it, when Protestants generally either reject, or certainly do not publicly advocate devotion to Mary?

The strangest thing about the initials AVM is that no one, not even Protestants who admit the authenticity of the stone (and their number like those of their Catholic brethren is increasing from day to day), give them any other interpretation excepting *Ave Maria,* or *Ave Virgo Maria.* After all, the invocation in runic "Save us from evil," must have been directed to some one. The AVM is the answer: Mary.

CONCLUSION

"The Kensington Stone with its religious message," concludes Mr. Peterson after a lengthy study of it, "is undoubtedly genuine." Professor Holand assures us that "the inscription is generally accepted as genuine."[33] After devoting over thirty years of scholarly research to the Kensington Stone Professor Holand is the most ardent defender of its genuineness. In this he is upheld by Professor W. S. Wallace, librarian of the University of Toronto, who in the March, 1939, number of the *Canadian Historical Review* confesses: "Personally I find it easier to believe that the Kensington Stone is genuine than that it is a modern forgery."[34] Eilert Pastor, German historian, in *Wacht im Osten* (May, 1937), after prolonged studies concerning the Kensington Stone, categorically states: "None can any longer doubt its genuineness and one must consider it an important link in the history of the inhabitants of two continents—the most important runic inscription known to mankind."[35]

[32] *Ibid.*, pp. 78 f.

[33] Peterson, *op. cit.* p. 80.

[34] P. 17.

[35] Pp. 17 f.

It is consoling to Catholic Americans, priests and laymen alike, to know that almost five centuries before the bishops of the United States selected Mary in the mystery of her Immaculate Conception as the patroness of the Church in America, thirty Norsemen, one or the other of them possibly a priest, on the shores of a lake in Minnesota, had invoked her protection, imploring her to save them from harm.

RAPHAEL M. HUBER, O.F.M.CONV.
The Catholic University of America,
Washington, D. C.

THE GREATNESS OF JOHN HENRY NEWMAN

Newman's greatness lies in the complexity of his character and in the variety of his deeds as well as in their magnitude. As a non-Catholic he played a leading role in the Oxford movement. As a Catholic he equalled and surpassed his previous successes, both as a religious leader and as a preacher of the Word. He extended his mastery over the English language and put English prose to new and most beautiful uses; he gave the world one of its great autobiographical documents; he produced a book unique in modern philosophy; he wrote one of the most original of English poems. He established the Oratory of St. Philip Neri in England; he advanced education by founding the oratory School and by his work in Ireland; he performed the very greatest services to the English people in the cause of toleration and good will; he gave intellectual, moral, and social representation to the English Catholic group, and by so doing he raised the prestige of Catholics throughout the English-speaking world, and elsewhere too.

Because Newman did all this and more, the title of great is one that few will deny him. If it be a test of greatness for a man to leave a permanent impression upon his world, then again is Newman's claim beyond contest. This achieve nt . . . . was in the service of a genuine freedom, in opposition to a dom nant liberalism, which he saw as leading inevitably to the defeat and enslavement found among men and nations today.

—Rt. Rev. Msgr. John K. Ryan, in his Introduction to *American Essays for the Newman Centennial,* edited by John K. Ryan and Edmond Darvil Benard (Washington, D. C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1947), p. xii.

ST. THOMAS GOES TO SUMMER SCHOOL

Re-awakened interest in theology as a subject of instruction for religious and the laity has brought forth a rather sizeable amount of literature dealing with objectives, methods and problems allied with the presentation of courses in theology to such groups. In the interest of indicating an approach to certain problems encountered in these courses, the following report is presented on the teaching of the *Summa theologica.*

There are some who maintain that theology has no practical value for those outside seminaries; there are others who believe that the teaching of theology to religious and the laity is a task so fraught with difficulties as to be well-nigh impossible. The premisses for such conclusions logically involve certain basic misconceptions of the nature of theology and a lack of experience in dealing with this science outside the seminary environment. Theology, as a specifically distinct science, has its own proper object which is a well organized and integrated knowledge of God and of all things in their relation to God. Because of the universality of its object it is possible to direct this science to various uses. In the seminaries, for example, the science of theology is taught with a view to its use in the *magisterium* of the Church; in some study-clubs, theology is presented for use in the lay apostolate; certain professional groups study theology with the idea of using it as an aid in fulfilling the duties of law and medicine. In all these fields, theology retains its proper nature; and the difference in the courses is explained by the diverse uses to which the science will be put.

The following is a report of the presentation of the *Summa theologica* during the summer session at St. Xavier's College, Chicago, Ill. The courses were planned during the scholastic year 1945-46 by the college administration under the guidance of Rev. William R. Barron, O.P., who was then chaplain of the college and professor of philosophy. An attempt on the part of one professor to present the agreed courses in an adequate fashion would have placed him in the unenviable position of a priest trying to carry out the liturgy of Holy Week unaided, so the services of the writer were secured. These two professors were the only ones engaged in presenting the courses.

The purpose of the theology taught during the summer session

was not the production of professional theologians; much less was it to grind out a mass of information which would be used subsequently in the factual implementation of courses taught by the students. These courses were planned to lead the students to a deeper, more organized and better integrated knowledge of God and of all other things in their relation to God. Because of the nature of the doctrine presented, a more personal result could be expected because, as Pius XI said, ". . . the controlling purpose of every part of the theology of St. Thomas is precisely to enable us to lead a life of closer intimacy with God Himself." This broad concept of the nature of theology was specified by the purpose for which this scientific knowledge was intended. The classes were made up of teaching Sisters and the matter was presented with a view to its use in the educational apostolate of the students.

While all those taking the courses were Sisters engaged in teaching, their activities and backgrounds differed widely. Some of the Sisters taught the elementary grades; others were engaged in secondary education; none of them taught at the college or graduate levels. Most of the Sisters were working for degrees, but not all of them had begun their classes in philosophy. There were about forty-five Sisters in each class.

The tracts on the theological and cardinal virtues were selected as the matter for instruction. Because of the important role of virtue in the Catholic concept of education, these tracts have an evident relation to the use envisaged for the course in general. One group covered the theological virtues and the other the cardinal virtues. Taken together, the courses embraced the matter of the second section of the second part of the *Summa theologica.*

Both courses were listed in the catalogue of the college and credit was given in the customary manner. The summer session lasted for six weeks and each class was a double period totalling one hour and forty minutes of instruction. The prospect of covering a sizable amount of matter with such a varied group in so short a time gave rise to certain misgivings. It was clear that some preliminary notions of theology, of dispositions, of habits and virtues would be necessary, and it was feared that so much time would be consumed in establishing the basic notions that little would remain to cover the matter. Such fears and misgivings proved groundless.

On the first day of class each student was given a copy in English of an abbreviated outline of the *Summa.* Together with this outline,

they received four mimeographed sheets containing the definitions and divisions of theology and the basic notions of dispositions, habits and virtues. There was a brief explanation of the division of the virtues and of the principles upon which this division was based. One portion of the notes comprised the translation and explanation of St. Thomas' prologue to the *Summa* and a synopsis of the prologue to the tract on the virtues. Included in these preliminary notes was some information on the life, writings and authority of St. Thomas.

Each Sister was required to have a copy of the third volume of *A Companion to the Summa* by Walter Farrell, O.P. The use of this book will be discussed later.

Three methods were employed in presenting the course to the students: lectures supplemented by mimeographed notes; outlining the text of *A Companion to the Summa;* and the solving, by the students, of problems related to the virtues which they were studying in class.

NOTES AND LECTURES

Notes prepared by the teachers were mimeographed and supplied to the students at the beginning of each class. These notes were taken from the *Summa* and followed the content, method and order of St. Thomas in a manner accommodated to the specific use for which the class matter was destined. Only the key articles of the various questions were included in the notes and sometimes entire questions were omitted because they were not amenable to the specific use of the students. The interpretations of Sacred Scripture found in the *Summa* were included frequently. The doctrine presented in the notes was compressed within the limits of clarity and adequate presentation.

All the matter treated in the mimeographed notes was fully explained within the limits of the special objective of the course. The Sisters made their own additions to the notes supplied, but the extent of this note-taking was left to individual discretion. There was no dictation of notes.

It was the ordinary policy to compress into the notes only the main doctrine of the key articles. When the matter handled by St. Thomas in answers to objections would clarify or usefully augment the chief considerations, such matter was explained orally by the

teacher. Sometimes the importance of these teachings warranted inclusion in the notes. For example, when the notes on the virtue of Prudence were in preparation, it was decided to include the answer to an objection which contains St. Thomas' instruction for the improvement of memory.[1] These succinctly phrased suggestions for memorization provoked so much interest—especially when compared with the laws of association developed by modern psychology—that a lively discussion followed and many practical applications in the field of education were suggested. It would be a safe supposition that many school children of the Chicago area are now improving their memories according to rules laid down by a friar almost seven centuries ago.

Throughout all the notes and lectures, constant reference was made to the outline of the *Summa*. The blackboard was used extensively to keep the vision of the synthesis of St. Thomas constantly before the class. This insistence on the proper relation of particular matter to the whole synthesis is of prime importance in teaching the doctrine of St. Thomas at any level.

OUTLINING *A COMPANION TO THE SUMMA*

As often as a new section of the tract was begun in class, the students were required to outline the corresponding part of *A Companion to the Summa*. This was done according to a plan explained at the beginning of the course. Fr. Farrell's books have an outline preceding each chapter. The Sisters were to read the assigned chapter very carefully and verify the members of the outline in the margin of the text. After sufficient time was allowed for this work, the students' outlines were compared with that made by the teacher and any mistakes in their work were corrected. This use of *A Companion to the Summa* served the double purpose of adding to the course an element of completeness not otherwise attainable within the allotted time, and of insuring a conscientious and intelligent reading of the text.

PROBLEM SOLVING

The third technique used in presenting this course in theology was problem solving. This does not mean that casuistry was taught;

[1] *Sum. theol.*, II-II, q. 49, a. 1, ad 2.

emphasis was upon the reasoned solution of problems relating to the virtues in the light of principles already understood. The purpose of this device was to actualize the students' knowledge under varied circumstances and thereby to radicate the science more perfectly in their minds.

Each class began with a discussion of difficulties remaining from the previous lecture. Following this, the teacher would present certain problems for discussion. These problems were devised by the teachers with a view to the special purposes to which the course would be put and emphasis was on the solving of problems related to the theological and cardinal virtues. In this phase of the instruction, the activity and participation of the students was stressed while the teacher served as a guide and sometimes as an umpire.

In the beginnings of the course, some difficulty was encountered in promoting discussion among the students. Calling upon individuals produced dutiful recitations which lacked the spontaniety necessary for a "live" class. Experienced educators agree that this difficulty is frequently encountered in classroom discussion, but there seemed to be an especial reluctance on the part of the Sisters to discuss theology which was so new to them. There may also have been an added element of fear that any mistakes would be branded as heresies. Consequently, considerable and discreet encouragement of the students was necessary in the beginning. It was found most helpful to present some topic of common interest to all and to employ the discussions of this topic as a vehicle for instructing the class in the matter of the virtues through examples.

While the tract on justice was being taught, the local papers carried detailed accounts of a certain murder-case. The interest of the class was awakened by discussing the case in terms of the virtue of justice and by suggesting methods of education which would prevent the Sisters' charges from falling into evil ways. A brief account of the developments of the trial served to furnish many concrete examples illustrating the principles governing the action of judges, jurors, witnesses, and others involved in the judicial processes.

Another device which served to make the class apply the principles taught in the theology course to their everyday work was a discussion of evaluative criteria in educational institutions. At the beginning of one class the teacher introduced himself as a representative of an educational accrediting agency who had been

sent to inspect the schools in which the members of the class were teaching. It was explained that the various schools had already submitted a digest of their philosophy of education incorporating the salient points of the Encyclical of Pius XI *On The Christian Education Of Youth.* Various members of the class were called upon to demonstrate how the philosophy was being applied, for example in an English or mathematics class. This provoked a great deal of creative discussion about the formation of virtues through pedagogical devices and the relation of varied subjects to each other in the virtues of science and wisdom. The moral formation of students through discipline and supernatural means and motives was emphasized. Altogether, the discussion showed that the class had a good grasp of fundamental principles and that they would be able to understand some modern trends in terms of the virtues in which they were being instructed.

The technique of problem solving was continued in the weekly written examinations. Each Monday three problems were offered for analysis and solution in terms of the matter covered during the previous week. These problems were culled from newspaper articles, magazines, advertisements, and any other source which could furnish material amenable to the use of theology in the educational apostolate.

Once the examination contained a fictitious death-notice which contained an imaginary account of the deceased man's philanthropies, multiple marriages, and the final disposition of his property. There was no hint of any supernatural motivation in the entire account and some of the deeds listed as "virtues" were in reality vices bearing the semblance of true virtue. This account was to be analyzed according to the principles of the virtue of prudence, and all defects noted were to be corrected by concrete suggestions concerning the application of that virtue to the right ordering of human life. Most of the answers proceded logically from the distinction of natural and supernatural prudence and went on to uncover the simulated virtues and to indicate the imprudent choice of means in relation to the true goal of life. The suggestions for improvement which were offered indicated a grasp on the true concept of morality and the relation of prudence to the leading of the Christian life.

It would not be proper to attempt any specific evaluation of the results of the course. There is no way presently available to de-

termine how well the course was used in accomplishing the purposes for which it was devised. Next Summer a survey will be made to obtain the reactions and suggestions of those who have tried to use theology in their teaching apostolate for a year. No doubt this information will permit a greater clarification of the special use to which the courses are put and will suggest new pedagogical techniques to further the special objectives of these courses for teaching Sisters.

A complete survey will not be possible until one group has completed the entire cycle of theology. For the present, some assistance can be sought from surveys now in process of compilation at Rosary College, River Forest, Ill., and at Albertus Magnus College, New Haven, Conn. At both of these colleges a complete four-year course of St. Thomas' theology is presented to all students and is the integrating factor in their college education. Although the courses offered to lay students for use in fulfilling the duties of their vocations in life are not exactly the same as courses intended for the use of teaching Sisters, surveys of the courses for laymen should reveal findings useful in perfecting the courses intended for Sisters. In spite of the diverse uses intended, all courses in theology must retain a common nature because all share in a common ultimate object, viz., a more perfect and practical knowledge of God and of all other things in relation to God.

Whatever the future holds for these courses in theology, St. Thomas has made his first appearance at the summer school of St. Xaxier College in Chicago; a group of Sisters has met in his works the Angelic Doctor who holds a position of unique pre-eminence among Catholic educators; a few more have begun the journey along the high road of the divine wisdom of theology.

THOMAS C. DONLAN, O.P.
College of the Immaculate Conception,
Washington, D. C.

MISSION INTENTION

"Sisters engaged in teaching and other works of zeal" is the Mission Intention for the month of July, 1947.

CHALLENGE OF THE NATIONAL SHRINE

A writer recently referred to a particular section of the National Shrine of the Immaculate Conception, on the grounds of The Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C., as a "hall of disappointment." It was only to a certain section he was referring, but the same remark could be made of the whole National Shrine, for today it has all the ear-marks of frustration and remains as it has stood for a quarter of a century, a challenge to all lovers of the Mother of Christ in our land.

The National Shrine was begun twenty-seven years ago by Bishop Shahan, then Rector of The Catholic University of America, as a victory memorial to our soldier dead of World War I, and as a tribute to the patroness of the United States. It was not to be an ordinary Church. It was to be built by the rank and file of Catholics in America. At one time, among the friends of the Shrine, a question arose (which now appears to have been purely academic) as to who was to pay for the Shrine's completion—the wealthy or the poor. That discussion has long since ended. The Shrine has not been finished by anyone, and as one here in Washington today looks upon the unfinished building, beautiful within but hardly so without, and then thinks of the Anglican Cathedral, started at about the same time, just across the city, the comparison is embarrassing.

The proposal that a National Shrine be erected in honor of Our Lady, under the title, The Immaculate Conception, met at the beginning with an enthusiastic response. Two million dollars went into what we have today, but with the slackening of effort, unworthy of our pretended love for the Mother of Christ here in America, progress on the Shrine was halted. What had been done was worthy of the dream of the fonders of the Shrine and the glory of her who had been so honored. The altars, the mosaics, the pillars and the symbolism of the crypt are all that they should be, but the effect the Shrine now produces is one of gloom, disappointment and frustration. There are some who say the Shrine is altogether too big. But really is it bigger than America or our supposed love for Mary whom it honors? Others say, "Why hurry, it took five hundred years to complete Saint Peter's?" If we wait five hundred years to build this Shrine it will be the only thing we have copied from Europe recently. We built our country in less time than this—why should we keep Mary waiting?

The gloom that hangs above the Shrine has been broken lately by a series of encouraging events. Mindful of the fact that in 1954 we shall celebrate the centenary of the promulgation of the dogma of the Immaculate Conception many have become aware that to celebrate this anniversary with our National Shrine in its present condition would be the occasion of embarrassment on the part of Catholics in America. Mindful, too, that the present year 1947 is the 100th anniversary of the dedication of our land to the Immaculate Conception, fond admirers of Mary in America are beginning to realize that we here in America anticipated the church's promulgation of the dogma by seven years but that we are far behind in the full honor we have paid to our glorious Mother. The recent months have seen a stirring up of American Catholic interest in the Shrine. Two years ago a Bishops Committee was formed to hasten the Shrine's completion. The Committee consists of Archbishop Joseph F. Rummel; Archbishop Richard J. Cushing; Archbishop John Gregory Murray; Archbishop John J. Mitty; Bishop Peter L. Ireton; Monsignor Patrick J. McCormick, Rector of The Catholic University of America, and the present writer, with Bishop John F. Noll as chairman. At the last meeting of the hierarchy it was voted to launch a drive on Mothers Day for the purpose of collecting the five million dollars which will be necessary for the completion of the superstructure. The drive has been launched.

At a recent meeting of the newly formed National Marian Confederation, an organization which is seeking to co-ordinate the many Marian devotions in this country and thus make Mary's influence in our land more effective, seven leaders in the Marian Apostolate representing the Sodality, the Miraculous Medal, the Scapular Militia, the Rosary, the Family Rosary, the Marian Library, the Sorrowful Mother Novena, the National Federation of Catholic College Students and Our Lady of Perpetual Help, pledged themselves to devote the December issue of their magazines toward promoting the National Shrine for the next five years. The magazines and printed matter of these affiliated organizations find their way into nearly a million Catholic homes each month, and surely great fruit should come from this.

One religious community has already pledged $150,000 for the erection of a chapel in honor of the founder of this community. The Ladies of Charity of Washington are raising funds to erect a window in honor of their patron, Saint Louise; the National

Council of Catholic Nurses has begun a drive for funds to place a rose window memorial in the Shrine in memory of the nurses who served their country during the war.

The following excerpt from the Washington *Evening Star* of Saturday, April 19, indicates how the National Shrine appeals even to those outside the Church. An editorial in the *Star* read as follows:

> Such an adornment of the skyline of Washington would be an asset to the city if it were to be only a secular edifice. Its dedication to the Virgin gives it a character of spiritual beauty which surely will be attractive even to those persons who ordinarily are not interested in religion. The story of the synoptic Gospels from first to last will be dramatized in the Shrine so convincingly that even skeptics should be impressed. American Catholicism needs this further demonstration of faith and generosity. Fellow Christians of other groups are not barred from giving toward the plan's fulfillment if only as a gesture of support for the common civilization in which all citizens of the United States participate.

Many of the responses to the Bishops appeal for funds from the priests show renewed interest in Mary's Shrine. We quote from a few:

> No National Shrine to Mary Immaculate can every repay her for her loving care and protection of the United States of America.

> We ought to be ashamed of ourselves if we do not complete the National Shrine soon.

> As a Chaplain it was my privilege to leave this country on Mothers Day, 1942, and to be with combat troops as they finished the Tunisian campaign on Mothers Day, 1943. Upon my return home from service I had the pleasure of visiting the National Shrine. I was duly impressed by the interior, but the exterior reminded me of a great work just begun, then discontinued simply because no one had the courage to ask the American people to complete it.

> The one who visits the Anglican Cathedrals of Saint John the Divine in New York and of Saint Albans in Washington, should be ashamed that the Catholic Basilica in the latter city remains unfinished. Canada with its Saint Anne de Beaupré near Quebec and Saint Joseph's Basilica at Montreal has outstripped us.

What has delayed the Shrine's completion is of course the very grandeur and size of the structure, but there was no way to avoid

this. It is a National Shrine, meant to be symbolic of the devotion to Our Lady in the hearts of her grateful American children. To be thus symbolic the Shrine had to be enormous. In fact, it is just short of the dimensions of Saint Peter's in Rome. The National Shrine had to be as big as it really is for there seems to be no limit to the devotion of American Catholics. The National Shrine will rise someday, stone on stone, an awe inspiring structure, dedicated to Mary Immaculate, patroness of our country. It will take its place with sister-shrines—Notre Dame de Paris, Santa Maria Maggiore of Rome and the Catholic Westminster Cathedral of London.

Some of the plans of the hierarchy have been carried out. Bishop Noll has appealed to all the Bishops. The Bishops have been asked to contribute to the erection of the main altar in the upper church. He has also appealed to the priests, both secular and religious, and to the women of religious communities. He had anticipated the drive on Mothers Day by appealing to priests and religious first that when they turned to the laity they would have been able to say, "This is what we have already done." Bishop Noll expected $1,000,000 from the priests alone. To spread the burden the Bishops thought that a five year plan would be the best plan for the Shrine. It will take a year for the completion of the plans alone. The ultimate goal of the Bishops is $5,000,000. In their deliberations last November they favored the opportunity being given to every man, woman and child in the United States, than when the Shrine is finished it will represent a contribution to the glory of Our Lady on the part of all.

Bishop Noll keynoted the appeal of the Hierarchy for the completion of the National Shrine when he stated, "It is very fitting that Mary through whom Christ came to us, and was God's loftiest and holiest creature, should be particularly honored in this day. . . . Catholics could not show in any better way their devotion to God Almighty and to His Church . . . than by the completion of this monument started twenty-seven years ago to honor Mary Immaculate as the patroness of our nation."

JOHN J. REILLY

Director, National Shrine of the Immaculate Conception, Washington, D. C.

THE STATUS OF SCHOLARSHIP ON ST. THOMAS MORE

If the publication of historically important scholarship is always an occasion of appreciation, there is an additional motive for all devotees of St. Thomas More to welcome the recent appearance of *Moreana 1478-1945: A Preliminary Checklist of Materials by and about Saint Thomas More,* by Frank and Majie Sullivan.[1] Indeed all serious students of the crucial age in which the layman-martyr lived should be grateful for this reference guide to more than twelve hundred books and articles dealing with the great sixteenth century English chancellor and literateur, during the past four hundred years.

Perhaps even more important than the biographical and bibliographical value of this work is its significance in the idealogical clash which rises to climatic violence in the world-warfare of our post-Christian twentieth century. After a preliminary examination of its content and quality, therefore, our chief concern with this bibliography shall be the inferences which it permits, as a document in Christian history. There may be some comfort as well as instruction, for our times, in the contemplation of this literary history of a person whom a biographer of his own age proclaimed "our blessed Protomartyr of all the laity for the preservation of the Unity of Christ's Church."[2]

MATERIALS BY ST. THOMAS MORE

Considering the Sullivans' modest description of this list as "a preliminary study, which attempts to do nothing more than list coherently the principal publications by and about our subject," we must regard their work as admirably done. The basis of coherence is that of alphabetical arrangement, by authors' names; and we may turn first to the letter "M" for the most important and revealing section, namely the uncollected letters and primary editions of writings which appear under the name of St. Thomas More.

[1] Published in lithographic form by Rockhurst College, Kansas City, Missouri, 1946.

[2] Nicholas Harpsfield, *The Life and Death of Sir Thomas More, Knight* (ed. E. V. Hitchcock for the *Early English Text Society,* London, 1932), p. 213.

Here the search for a record of every extant version of each of More's own writings seems to have been remarkably attentive and complete. To the thirty-six listed Latin editions of *Utopia,* for example, only one other (Helmstadt, 1672) may be added here.[3]

Brief attention may be directed to additional editions of several other works by this versatile saint. Though less famous than Pater's study, St. Thomas' English biography of *John Picus Mirandula,* the Italian humanist who was in so many respects a model for his own career, is extant in another edition by de Worde (London, 1523). Our famous humanist's *Epigrammata,* that collection of witty Latin verses which found such flattery in later English imitations and translations, should be noted also in connection with an edition of his *Epistola ad Brixium* (London: Pynson, 1520). To the many editions of More's *History of Richard III,* the first English historiography worthy of the name, we ought to add that of M. Drayton (London, 1825). His famous *Dialogue of Comfort* (which he composed in prison for the confirmation of his fellow-Catholics during the persecution of Henry VIII, "the great Turk"), was also printed by J. Barker (London, 1847). And The Union Theological Seminary owns a copy of the frequently questioned second edition of this layman-theologian's *Supplication of Souls.* Most bibliographers are aware only of the British Museum's two-leaf fragment of this version of St. Thomas' diverting development of the Christian doctrine on Purgatory.

How relatively unimportant these suggested additions to the record of More's canon really are may be seen in the perspective of *Utopia* alone. One late edition, more or less, is not likely to detract from this record which includes, besides the thirty-six Latin versions we have already noted, an almost incredible number of printings of vernacular translations: into English (138), German (13), French (12), Italian (6), Spanish (5), and Russian (1).

With allowance always for a margin of disaffected partisanship, future research on St. Thomas More will undoubtedly concern itself more positively with the exposition and evaluation of his highly conscious utterances in defense of the Catholic faith. Only the naive or the intransigeant can continue to maintain the weight

[3] The Edinburgh Library *Catalog,* which contains this reference, reveals also an edition of More's *Opera* dated at Basle in 1562. If this date is correct, this edition is one year earlier than the first which the Sullivans have listed for his Latin works.

of either *Utopia* or *Richard III,* harmonious as they are with Christian principle, against St. Thomas' zealous *Dialogue Concerning Heresies;* his gigantic *Confutation of Tyndale's Answer;* his closely reasoned *Debellation* on the status of seditious heretics before the law; or his inspiring and at times exalted *Apology,* his autobiographical swansong to all religious controversy as he foresaw a nobler way of bearing testimony to the Faith.

From the point of view of these also highly literate expressions, the most important step in this new direction must yet remain the completion of modern critical editions of both his English and his Latin works,[4] and of both his published and unpublished letters. Also essential to this future scholarship will be an exhaustive concordance to these works, and perhaps even (as M. Delcourt has enthusiastically suggested) an *Encyclopedia Moreana.* Upon the availability of such documents and tools, it must be emphasized (but particularly upon the putting of all his works in print!) will depend St. Thomas More's tradition during the next four hundred years.

MATERIALS ABOUT THE SAINT

So much for More's textual status. When we turn next to the works of later authors who have chosen for a theme some aspect of his towering personality, we cannot fail to be impressed by their variety and extent. Some thousand articles and books, ranging from the most objective scholarship to the extreme limits of intellectual inversion, constitute a veritable index of More scholarship, as a roll-call of some significant authors may suggest.

Among the "A's" stands sixteenth century Ascham, who was first to recognize More's power of historiography; and St. Augustine, whose *City of God* inspired a now-lost commentary by our saint. "Billious Bale," whose bibliography is here, must now submit to the corrective focus of Fr. Bridgett's basic biography in modern times. Here also we find Brendan Brown's welcome addition to the legal literature on More.

Contemptuous Coulton, who collected the curiosities of mediaeval penitentiaries and called them Christian history (already losing

[4] W. E. Campbell and his associates have undertaken a monumental edition of More's *English Works,* of which the first two volumes have appeared. The present writer is engaged in assistance on the preparation of Volumes III and IV.

caste within his school)[5] must here consort perforce with the canonization documents in the cause of Thomas More, and with Campbell, the current editor of More's *English Works*.

Between the names of the repentant Fish and the infamous propagandist, Foxe, appear four references to works by More's fellow martyr from the clergy, St. John Fisher.

A new chapter of historical sweetness and scholarly light in the More tradition reveals the great work of Gairdner and of Gasquet; and Harpsfield's early *Life of More*, with its enrichment of content from the Saint's own writings, has at last its deserved precedence over the histories of Holinshed. Here we may also note the French work of Janelle; the dialectic communism of Kautsky; and the late leadership of Fr. Lingard, whose service to More's cause cannot be repaid by man.

Macaulay's muse with all its rhetoric must stand immediate comparison, in this compilation, with the magnificent eulogy of Lord Macintosh; and perhaps a grateful student will be permitted to rejoice that in the company of these nineteenth century writers on St. Thomas More stands John Marsdon, "the master of those who know" More's Latin poetry.

Pace's early reference to More's knowledge of Greek may be here verified, and the vast Catholic erudition of Professor Phillimore (who has traced the decline of English humanism to the death of More) compared with the praiseworthy objectivity of Professor Pollard.

Rastell and Reed are both illustrious within More's editorial ranks; and son-in-law Will Roper, despite a temporary lapse into Lutheranism, here proves his own repentance with some thirty recorded editions of his reverential *Life of More*.

[5] Cf. H. S. Bennett, *Life on the English Manor: A Study of Peasant Conditions 1150-1400*. (New York, 1937), vii: "we are forced to piece together our pictures from materials that were never meant to serve such a purpose." Also, Owst, *Literature and Pulpit in Medieval England* (Cambridge, 1933), p. 566: "No one who has any knowledge of the subject-matter will be inclined to question . . . the validity of Dr. Coulton's actual sources. . . . But there is a further important question of the kind of conclusions which we are entitled to draw from such evidence as he produces, of where, in the midst of so much apparently conflicting sentiment, the final emphasis should be laid. Here there is certainly room for some difference of opinion." (Owst has just finished expressing some basic conclusions contradictory to those of his old teacher).

Shakespeare is here shown with his share in the play, *Sir Thomas More*.[6] And savage Swift is duly credited for having singled out our saint as "the person of greatest virtue that this kingdom ever produced."

First name among the "T's" is that of Taft. His editorial lucubrations upon More's *Apologye* (a vigorous defense of his own Catholic Action), affords additional rebuttal of the entries under that of Tyndale who "cribbed" an English *Testament*,[7] and whose name is last.

Americans will note with pleased surprise the inclusion of

[6] W. W. Greg *(Malone Society Reprints XXXI,* 1911) offers the best of the various editions of this remarkable manuscript, which affords possibly the only surviving record of Shakespeare's handwriting beyond his signature. Both as a sample of Shakespearean flavor and as a traditional view of St. Thomas More's thought-processes, the following passage in which More is addressing a group of anti-foreign rioters invites attention:

> Grant them removed, and grant that this your noise
> Had chid down all the majesty of England
> Imagine that you see the wretched strangers
> Their babies at their backs and their poor luggage,
> Plodding to the ports and coasts for transportation.
> And that you sit as kings in your desires
> And hourly quite silenced by your brawl
> And you in ruff of your opinions clothed
> What had you got? I'll tell you. You had taught
> How insolence and strong hand should prevail,
> How order should be quelled and by this pattern
> Not one of you should live an aged man.
> For other ruffiians, as their fancies wrought
> With self-same hand, self reasons and self-right
> Would shark on you; and men like ravenous fishes
> Would feed on one another.

Although the Sullivans have the right to exclude the extensive discussions of this play from the scope of their study, they really ought to list S. A. Tannenbaum's bibliography, entitled *Anthony Munday, Including The Play of Sir Thomas Moore* (New York, 1942).

[7] Dr. Mombert, in reviewing a reprint of Tyndale's *New Testament*, concludes that Tyndale's wholesale appropriation of Luther's textual renderings "fully justifies the assertion of Tyndale's contemporaries that he reproduced in English Luther's German Testament" *(Athenaeum,* May 2, 1885, p. 563).

For Luther's unacknowledged appropriation, in turn, of critical textual renderings from the Greek in earlier German Bible translations than his own, cf. Albert Freitag, "Luthors Benutzung der deutschen Bibel des Mittelalters bei siner Bibelübersetzung," *Forshungen und Fortschritte* V (1929), 306 f.

Americus Vespucci; his *Navigationes* was a source for More's imaginary journey to *Utopia.* It also inspired an ill-fated project for colonizing the New World. As if to leave no doubt of More's world-significance, the secondary bibliography on More concludes with the names of a Russian, Yakovenko; a Spaniard named Zavala; and of that German victim of his own *zeitgeist,* Stefan Zweig.

ADDITIONAL MATERIALS ABOUT THE MARTYR

Besides suggesting the comprehension and variety of scholarship on More, these selected citations will serve to indicate the immense labor behind the compilation as a whole. For a list of *Moreana* within human limitations, the principal materials are surely here. Nor was it to be expected that even the diligence of the Sullivans should have unearthed an earlier unpublished effort in the same direction by Sister Bertille Klingele, S.Sp.S.[8]

To suggest *Doctoral Dissertations Accepted by American Universities* for such items as Hoyt Hudson's study of More's Epigrams[9] or Thompson's work on his Lucianic translations,[10] is but to mention an ambivalent source which they undoubtedly have consulted without the present critic's luck. Similarly, there is an institutional study of Adolphe Franck[11] which is probably listed in the *Catalogue* of the Bibliotheque Nationale. Not all humanistic libraries will list the *Vierteljahrschrift für Kultur und Literatur Renaissance,* with its inviting monograph on More and Machiavelli.[12] Equally difficult to find, perhaps, is Julius Reiner's study of

[8] *A Bibliographic Study of St. Thomas More,* an M.A. Dissertation (DePaul University Library, 1945).

[9] Hoyt Hudson's Princeton doctoral dissertation of Anglo-Latin Epigrams in the English Renaissance has never been published. Shortly before his death in 1945, this generous scholar lent the present writer a radically revised manuscript of his valuable study—which the estate by all means should publish.

[10] Craig R. Thompson, *Lucian and Lucianism in the English Renaissance* (Princeton, 1937). The author of this distinguished study has made its conclusions generally available in an abstract, *The Translations of Lucian by Erasmus and St. Thomas More* (Ithaca, 1940).

[11] *Reformateurs et publicistes de l'Europe: Moyen Age, Renaissance* (Paris, 1864).

[12] By G. Ellinger, in II (1887).

ideal commonwealths,[13] if not two studies of the relationship between More and Ben Jonson by Baskerville[14] and O'Loughlin.[15] Zeeveld's recent special plea[16] will help to bring the bibliography of *Richard III* down to date. And since the editors have included the other studies of Fr. McNabb they will welcome also his study on More's *History of the Passion.*[17]

Creative literature based on More has fared quite well. There should be some indication, however, that Blackwell's *Blessed Thomas More* (1931) and Sister Mary Donatus's *Greater Glory* (1939) are dramatic compositions. The tragedy by Hurdis should be listed in the subject-index of other plays about More. An Italian play,[18] is listed in the British Museum *Catalog;* and there is Archibald Foxe's more available *Sir Thomas More: An Historical Play* (London, 1905). Less important, but hardly to be ignored, is Mary Fisher's epistolary study of *Sir Thomas More and the Reformation.*[19]

Perhaps for the biographical background it was not necessary to note Fishwick's *Proceedings of the Duchy Court* of Lancaster (1896) nor the Chancery materials published by the Selden Society (XII, 1898). But one may hope for the later inclusion of such items as Fuller's biographical notice in his *Worthies,*[20] and because it is earlier, Thomas Mortimer's "Life of Sir Thomas More."[21] Articles by Finlayson[22] and Cardinal Manning[23] would suggest the potentialities in a more thoroughgoing investi-

[13] *Berühmte Utopisten und ihr Staatsideal* (Jena, 1906).

[14] "Some Parallels to Bartholomew Fair," *Modern Philology* VI (1908), 108 f.

[15] "Recusant Poets: St. Thomas More—Ben Jonson," *Review of English Studies,* XVI (1940), 466 f.

[16] "A Tudor Defense of Richard III," *P.M.L.A.,* LV (1940), 946 f.

[17] In *Blackfriars,* XXII (1941), 338 f. Cf. also *The Month* CLXXVII (1941), 475 f.

[18] *Tomm Moro Lord Chancelliere d'Inghilterra,* in *Collezione di Letture ameme ed oneste,* LXXII (Modena, 1872).

[19] *Twenty-five Letters on English Authors* (Chicago, 1895).

[20] (London, 1840) II, 361 f.

[21] *The British Plutarch,* ed. by Charles Dilly (London, 1791), I, 63 f.

[22] "The Age of Morton, Wolsey and More." *Dublin Review* (1856), 1 f.

[23] "Henry VIII and the Suppression of the Greater Monasteries," *ibid.* (1889), 243 f.

gation of the periodical indexes, in this case of the *Dublin Review*. There is a rather long biographical chapter in Ignaz Klug's *Ringende und Reifende* (Paderborn, 1921). Perhaps only a professional scholar would recognize at once the pertinence to More's career of a study entitled "Was Bishop William Barlow Friar Jerome;"[24] even if it were listed here, it would illustrate more than anything else the necessity of annotation if bibliography is ever to realize its full usefulness. But a closer examination of Catholic sources of bibliography should reveal more articles, such as have appeared in *Ave Maria*[25] and *Magnificat*[26] and printings of 1935 by the Fordham[27] and Carmelite[28] presses. Some students, in addition, might appreciate the mention of Rouneau's French[29] and de Luca's Italian[30] translations of Sargent's biography of More.

There is also an available article by Hagrefe, on "Sir Thomas More's Connection with the Roper Family."[31] And although *Notes and Queries* presumably has been well used in the biographical tradition, such recent communications as "Sir Thomas More, His Descendants"[32] should be included. Grunow's "Sir Thomas More" in *Zeitschrift für neusprachlichen Unterricht* (1935) illustrates the possibilities in further reference to the German periodical indexes. The London *Times* index, as a matter of fact, reveals an additional entry, entirely beyond the proportions of its wordage, on "St. Thomas More's Body; Search in St. Luke's Church, Chelsea."[33]

THE MORE TRADITION IN THE HISTORY OF THE WEST

The place of St. Thomas More in English history and literature is revealed most surely in the increasing flow through time, of books and articles which have shown the concern of Western civili-

[24] A. Koszul, in *Review of English Studies,* IV (1928), 25 f.

[25] M. B. O'Delany, "Memories of Chelsea," XXXII (1930), 176 f.

[26] P. Kurth, "Adopted Daughter of Sir Thomas More," LII (1933), 283 f.

[27] A. G. Hagan, *Sir Thomas More: Sovereignty over Self through the Sovereignty of God.*

[28] Albert H. Dolan, O.Carm., *Sir Thomas More.*

[29] (Paris, 1935).

[30] *Tommaso Moro* (Brescia, 1940).

[31] *P.M.L.A.,* XLVII (1932), 523 f.

[32] C. Moor, CLXVIII (June 29, 1935), 458.

[33] W. G. Arrowsmith (Oct. 6, 1936), 8E.

zation with every aspect of his life and work. From the Paris *News-letter* of 1535, with its circumstantial report of More's death, down to the account of his canonization, four hundred years later, in the London *Times;* from Roper's manuscript biography down to Chamber's definitive *Life;* from Robinson's furtive English translation of *Utopia* down to a Russian version in our own century; from Shakespeare's eloquent testimony of his dramatic character down to the latest play by Sister Mary Novatus, of Immaculata College in Pennsylvania: what a history, and what an odyssey, of scholarship is here!

To all who reflect for long upon the vicissitudes of human experience, or upon the inevitable changes which have marked the history of our race, there comes frequent encouragement in the phenomena of cyclical return. The sun may travel ever toward the west, but the sun also rises. If winter comes, spring is not far behind. There is a time to sow, and a time to reap. War is followed by peace—and martyrdom by glory. The mystery of iniquity may work its will and add the crime of slander to that of judicial murder, as in the case of Thomas More. But justice must eventually prevail. And truth is the daughter of time.

This cyclical promise and its eventual fulfilment is of transcendant comfort to the historical Christian who, while he contemplates past triumphs of his Faith, must ever face the spiritual storm peculiar to his own age. Scarce had Christ's infant Church lost the last of the Apostles, when it was shaken to its roots by the heresy of Gnosticism with its vicious doctrine of physical depravity. But the Church survived and grew. In the fourth century, Arians attacked the historic Christian faith by denying the divinity of Christ. Four hundred years later, when this danger was past, the Christian community had to face the threat of Islam from without; and four hundred years later still, that of the Albigensians from within.

And it is only in the chronological perspective of the last four hundred years that St. Thomas More, first victim of the heresy of schismatic nationalism, provides a promise for our "modern age." There was a first sixteenth century wellspring, scarcely more than tears, of concerned admiration for More's humor and humility in the face of death. Then in the seventeenth century appeared such early thaws as the dedication of new editions of Roper's *Life* to Her Catholic Majesty in a vain hope for justice, long deferred, to the English Catholic cause. Filling the watersheds of eighteenth

century scholarship were sparkling journalistic streams, of which Addison's appreciation fortunately finds mention here. These, with the legal preoccupations of men like "Philonomos," were to develop into a nineteenth century torrent of books and articles carrying all prejudice before, and searching out each landmark of information about More's life, pedigree, appearance, household, and career, gorging (at times through intellectual granite) the channel of his tradition, until it has emerged at last into the sea of history as a great tide in the affairs of men.

In our own day, indeed, four hundred years from his death, when has come to him the last honor of human life, his being listed among the saints of God; in our own day when the dignity of human personality is so universally subjected, as was his own, to political outrage: the historic stature of St. Thomas More, even in the light of bibliography, is clear. He is the historic type and the perpetual patron of all who will defend to death the existence of a moral authority higher than that of the secular state. He died "the king's good servant, but God's *first.*" In this Christian sign his devotees may hope with reason, but still more with faith, to persevere, and thus preserve our Christian heritage.

JAMES F. LARKIN, C.S.V.

De Paul University,
Chicago, Ill.

SACRAMENTAL CHARACTER OF THE CHURCH

All heretical concepts of the common priesthood may be traced, then, to the tendency to make of Christianity a religion that is primarily and essentially personal and internal, rather than social and sacramental. The tendency is aggravated by the problem of evil in the visible Church, which in certain minds makes membership therein not a sufficiently certain sign of salvation. The tendency is realized in the conception of an invisible Church composed only of those who are holy, predestined and just. But the tendency is consummated in the complete rejection of all religious elements which are in any way external or visible, that is, in the rejection of the continuous sacramental mediation of Christ in the Church.

—*The Common Priesthood of the Members of the Mystical Body,* by James Edward Rea (Washington, D. C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1947), p. 128.

LEARNING IN THE DIOCESAN PRIESTHOOD

In order to do his sacerdotal work in the way God wills that he should do it, the diocesan priest needs, not only a high degree of spiritual perfection, but also a competent and scholarly understanding of scholastic theology. Fortunately, during the recent history of the Catholic Church at least, there has been no observable articulate denial of the need for sanctity in the secular priesthood. Even the questionably accurate writings that have been concerned with the spirituality of the diocesan priesthood, mainly, or so it would seem, for the purpose of comparing it quite unfavorably with that of the religious, have never ventured to deny that the secular priest requires a high degree of holiness in order to do his work properly. Such writings, with their frequently invidious and incorrect comparisons, seldom describe the spirituality of the *presbyterium* adequately. Still they never attempt to cast doubt upon the need for it.

Unfortunately, however, the necessity for and the position of learning in the diocesan priestly brotherhoods have not always been so well recognized. Although public denials that secular priests, as a body, constitute a learned group are as might be expected somewhat rare, the Catholic Church in the United States has met with one highly spectacular and public expression of this attitude. In one of the most interesting reminiscences of the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore that has come down to our time, Bishop Thomas S. Byrne told of an attack on the project of a Catholic University based on the explicit contention

> that the Diocesan Clergy were not intended to be an educated Clergy or at least a learned and erudite body; that they were ordained to do the ordinary work of a parish and that the proper custodians, cultivators, and representatives of learning in the Church were the Religious Orders to whom alone Universities should be entrusted.[1]

---

[1] This passage is taken from a letter written by Bishop Thomas S. Byrne, of Nashville, to Sister Mary Agnes McCann, of the Sisters of Charity of Cincinnati, on Dec. 3, 1917. As a young priest, Bishop Byrne was one of the two theologians brought to the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore, in 1884, by Archbishop William H. Elder of Cincinnati. His letter tells of Fr. Fulton's address to the Council and of the author's reply to this address. The document

The attitude which Bishop Byrne ascribed to Fr. Fulton is based, first of all, upon a faulty grasp of ecclesiastical history. Actually, as the records of learning in the Catholic Church show very well, the diocesan priesthood has always carried at least its share of the work of science and of erudition within the society of Our Lord's disciples. More important and more dangerous than the historical inaccuracy which underlies this attitude, however, is the erroneous theological background it betrays. To believe that the actual instruction of God's people on earth and the missionary activity inseparable from the work of the diocesan *presbyterium* are tasks which can adequately and properly be accomplished by men who are not particularly well versed in the sacred science is not merely to misrepresent the position and the function of the diocesan priesthood. This attitude involves a serious misunderstanding of the divine constitution of the Catholic Church itself.

Today there would seem to be little danger that statements like those Fr. Fulton is reported to have made will attract any serious attention or will develop into a theory. The peril to the work of the diocesan priesthood in our own time comes, not from men who are arguing against a particular group of secular priests, but from a practical attitude that can all too easily enter and dominate the minds of diocesan priests themselves. There is a serious danger that the very priests who might be most indignant about the public expression of sentiments like those attributed to Fr. Fulton might come to conduct their own lives as if those statements had been justified. In other words, while there is little chance that any untheological opponent of the diocesan priesthood will popularize the notion that learning does not belong in the *presbyterium,* there is a real possibility that some secular priests may feel themselves justified in trying to do their work as if theirs were other than a scholarly vocation.

The question with which we are primarily concerned in this particular paper is theological rather than merely historical. We are directly interested in the truth that the diocesan priesthood is a

---

is printed by Dr. John Tracy Ellis in *The Formative Years of the Catholic University of America* (Washington: American Catholic Historical Association, 1946), pp. 103-107. The passage quoted in this article is found on p. 104. The original letter is in the historical collection of Msgr. Peter Guilday at The Catholic University of America.

state which requires a high degree of theological competence, just as it demands a high degree of spiritual perfection, in those who are privileged to belong to the *presbyterium*. We are studying the evidence given us by and in sacred theology in favor of the truth that the diocesan priest needs a genuine competence in the science of the faith in order to do his work in the *presbyterium* as God wills that he should do it.

Any attempt to establish or explain this thesis, however, would be utterly useless were it not for the fact that we have ample and convincing historical evidence that the diocesan priesthood has always been a body endowed with adequate and definite theological competence. Naturally, every student is quite cognizant of the fact that at certain times and in some places the standards of theological learning among the secular priests have been less than satisfactory. Moreover those who have interested themselves in ecclesiastical history are also well aware that such unhappy lapses from adequate theological competence have by no means been restricted to the diocesan priesthood. Hence, when we speak of the historical evidence that the diocesan priesthood has always been a body learned in the science of sacred theology, we obviously do not intend to say that all individual secular priests at all times and in all places have been masters of the sacred science. We merely point to the historically ascertainable truth that, taken by and large during the course of the centuries and around the world, the secular priesthood as a body has shown its theological competence by the fact that very many diocesan priests have always been found among the more proficient writers and exponents of theology.

Anyone who takes the trouble to glance through Hurter's formidable *Nomenclator literarius* or Grabmann's *Geschichte der katholischen theologie* will quickly realize that the annals of sacred theology in post-patristic times tell of a great many very distinguished writers from the ranks of the diocesan priesthood. Secular priest professors have been numerous and strikingly competent on some of the great university faculties of sacred theology during the years. At such famed theological schools as Paris, and Louvain, and Douai, teachers from the diocesan priesthood wrote treatises that have benefited the universal Church of God. Throughout the Catholic world magnificent theological seminaries have been manned by secular priests. In our own country, few Catholic theologians have attained the excellence of Archbishops Francis Patrick Kenrick

and Martin John Spalding and James Cardinal Gibbons, all from the ranks of the diocesan priesthood.

Thus the fact that the diocesan priesthood has contributed a goodly share of the most important, influential, and learned teachers and writers in sacred theology may be taken as a valid indication that it has been, all in all, a decidedly learned body within the Catholic Church. Naturally, we do not mean to infer that every secular priest has had the theological science of a Driedo, or an Estius, or a Murray, any more than we should be willing to teach that every religious priest has possessed the doctrinal competence of a Reding, or a Suarez, or a Billuart. Nevertheless, the fact that the diocesan priesthood has been able to give a great number of distinguished theologians to the service of Christ in the Church, plus the fact that most of these men have devoted their talents in great measure to the training of secular priests and candidates for the secular priesthood, combine to render a denial that the diocesan priesthood has been a learned body historically untenable.

Those who question the theological eminence of the secular priests as a body are wont to assert that the best known names in the history of sacred theology since the patristic period have been those of religious, rather than of secular, teachers. This assertion is obviously correct. Nevertheless it points, not to any historical lack of theological competence in the diocesan priesthood as such, but to the presence of two other factors in the history of the sacred science. One of these factors has been the presence of a few completely outstanding men of genius among the teachers of theology since the middle ages. Such men as St. Thomas Aquinas and St. Robert Bellarmine have exercised an influence absolutely unequalled by any other writers in the Church since their times. The other factor (and this is a point of importance), has been the lack of special interest on the part of secular teachers and writers in the works of those secular professors who have gone before them. Where religious communities have, as a general rule at least, paid special attention to their own older theologians, secular priests have never given any special place to the productions of other diocesan priests. Yet, even in the periods when the best known of the religious masters of sacred theology were doing their work for Our Lord in the Church, the accomplishments and the influence of secular teachers were obvious and important.

Every Catholic schoolboy is well aware of the fact that the names

of three great religious priests, St. Thomas Aquinas, St. Bonaventure, and John Duns Scotus, dominate the history of late mediaeval theology. Yet people are sometimes inclined to forget that the outstanding reputation of the University of Paris for theological excellence had been gained by the secular priest masters of this University long years before the first chairs for religious were established in the year 1229, when Roland of Cremona, the first of the Dominican professors, began to teach there. Furthermore, during St. Thomas' two tours of duty at the University, nine of the fifteen chairs in the faculty of sacred theology were occupied by secular teachers.[2] None of these men gave evidence of the genius that characterized the Angelic Doctor, but, from the writings they have left, and from the length of their stay on the faculty, they certainly must have been quite competent. One of these secular Masters, incidentally, was the redoubtable Robert of Sorbonne. All of them, like the religious teachers, used the work of a secular priest, the *Four Books of Sentences* of Peter the Lombard, as the basic text-book in sacred theology.

The theological faculty of Paris did magnificent work in refuting the errors of the Reformation heresiarchs, at the time when the secular scholars of the Sorbonne had practically taken over the faculty itself. Joining with them in this work were the secular professors of Louvain and of Douai. The brilliant group of religious priests that centered around St. Peter Canisius and St. Robert Bellarmine became far more famous than their secular priest associates, but no one who has any understanding of counter-Reformation theology can fail to appreciate the excellence and the influence of these latter. Down through the centuries since that time, the secular teachers of sacred theology have continued, in their own way, the traditions of priestly learning so ably and gloriously manifested in the works of men like Latomus and Wiggers and Stapleton.

The reputations of the diocesan priest professors of sacred theology have suffered, in great measure, by reason of the fact that their brethren in the secular priesthood have never habitually taken any extraordinary measures to conserve their tradition. In uni-

[2] Cf. Glorieux, *Répertoire des maîtres en théologie de Paris au XIII^e siècle* (Paris: Vrin, 1933). The information about the professors for each academic year is contained in tables inserted after p. 228 of the first volume of this work.

versities and seminaries conducted by secular priests there has seldom been such a thing as a "house theology." When certain Jansenists at Louvain tried to dissuade Martin Steyaert from attacking the author of the *Augustinus* on the ground that it ill befitted one Louvain professor to attack another, Steyaert pointed to the fact that no one at the University was at all disturbed when the teachers there assailed the propositions of John Wiggers, a much more worthy and effective Louvain theologian.[3] This comparative indifference on the part of secular priests towards their own great masters of times past explains why the works of such men as Stapleton and Sylvius are quite difficult to find and why there can be seminarians in America not conversant with the lives and the theological works of Archbishop Francis Patrick Kenrick and Archbishop Martin John Spalding.

This lack of absorbing interest in the great exponents of their own tradition of learning is by no means creditable on the part of the diocesan priesthood. Such indifference has tended to obscure the fact that there always has been a great and profound tradition of theological science in the ranks of the diocesan priesthood. The cause of priestly learning and the appreciation of the Church itself suffer some detriment when the existence of this tradition is overlooked.

It would be a very serious mistake to imagine that the diocesan priest's obligation to cultivate true theological learning is based to any serious extent upon the historical tradition of theological science within the secular priesthood, even though the existence of such a tradition might very well be a valid and effective motive for promoting study in another sort of community within the Church of God. In other words, there would be nothing wrong in the conduct of a religious superior who would exhort his subjects to the study of sacred theology, giving as one of his principal reasons the claim that the high reputation of their congregation in affairs theological must not be allowed to fail. The secular priest, on the contrary, is bound to know his theology precisely and ultimately because his own individual priestly brotherhood, the diocesan *presbyterium,* demands theological competence on the part of its members by

[3] Steyaert's *Conclusiones theologicae seu assertio notarum in propositiones V famosas adversus Spongiam iis oppositam et alias quasdam objectiones,* in the first volume of his *Opuscula* (Louvain, 1742), p. 274.

reason of the divine constitution of the Church itself. Thus, while the tradition of theological learning within the secular priesthood is real and obvious, this tradition cannot be invoked as anything like a primary motive to encourage theological study within the diocesan clergy.

According to the divine constitution of the Catholic Church itself, the residential bishop is commissioned and obligated to act as the *perfector* of his diocese. As a member of the apostolic *collegium,* he acts as Our Lord's representative in the individual Christian community. He is the high priest, whose business it is to offer the eucharistic sacrifice for the faithful subject to his paternal rule and gathered around him before the altar. He is a ruler, who issues his commands and enforces them and who is competent to judge those entrusted to his apostolic authority. Above all, however, as a member of the apostolic college, he is the authoritative teacher, the witness for Christ before his own people and before the world. The Church militant, the company of the faithful over which the Holy Father rules with true and supreme episcopal authority, has been so instituted and constructed by Our Lord Himself that the fully developed local Christian communities within it are thus perfected in the supernatural life by the individual members of the apostolic *collegium,* in union with Peter's successor and subject to him.

Because, by its very nature, the individual local Church within the universal society of Christ's disciples requires that the bishop should have the support of a brotherhood of priests subject to him directly in bonds of sacerdotal obedience and ordered *unice et ex integro* to the task of aiding him in his apostolic care for his flock, it follows that the members of this priestly brotherhood, the diocesan *presbyterium,* must be truly, though obviously in a subordinate capacity, the *perfectores* of the people. Since the priestly brotherhood over which the bishop presides and to which he himself belongs is essentially and necessarily consecrated to the work of the bishop, membership in this sacerdotal community carries with it the obligation and need for personal holiness. That is why the bishop primarily, and the diocesan priests of his own *presbyterium* truly, though in a derived and subordinate capacity, are in the *status perfectionis adquisitae,* by reason of their function in communicating and in increasing the life of grace among those for whose spiritual care God holds them responsible. And, because the

bishop, and hence the members of his *presbyterium,* must act as *perfectores* in the intellectual order, by giving the men and women entrusted to them an accurate and adequate instruction in the divine and apostolic message of salvation, the bishop and his diocesan priests are bound by the strictest sort of obligation to obtain and to perfect within themselves an understanding of divine public revelation sufficiently acurate and profound to enable them competently to instruct in the Christian faith the men and women for whom Our Lord offered the sacrifice of His life on Calvary.

The only way in which men, by their own efforts, can acquire this intellectual competence to teach the faith of Jesus Christ is through the study of sacred theology. Theology is truly and eminently "the science of the faith."[4] The theses or conclusions in which the contents of this science are expressed are actually statements of that message which Our Lord preached (and which He still preaches) within the society of His disciples as divine revelation. Theological conclusions are so fashioned as to exclude the danger of error and ambiguity. Each thesis carries with it a theological proof, a body of evidence tending to show beyond the possibility of reasonable doubt that this individual statement actually conveys the very truth that the Church has received from Christ through the teaching of the apostolic college.

The diocesan *presbyterium* is essentially a teaching brotherhood. The one body of doctrine the diocesan priesthood is divinely instituted to present to the people, when it acts as the instrument of the bishop and under his direction, is the divinely revealed Christian truth. By virtue of the divine constitution of the Catholic Church itself, the diocesan *presbyterium* is charged with the responsibility of aiding the bishop in the accomplishment of his duty to bring adequate and accurate instruction in the faith to the people subject to his care and authority. It is only by acquiring and by increasing within himself the *habitus* of sacred theology that the individual diocesan priest can render himself competent to discharge the sacred work to which his life and that of his sacerdotal brotherhood must be consecrated.

Thus sacred theology is actually the professional science of the *presbyterium.* A diocesan priest needs to know theology in order

[4] Cf. Fenton, *The Concept of Sacred Theology* (Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Company, 1941), pp. 1 ff.

to do his work properly just as truly as an attorney needs to know law or a physician, medicine. The reason why the *science* of sacred theology is required for the work of the *presbyterium* is thus to to be found in the very nature of the doctrinal mission Our Lord has given to His Church.

Theology, as a science, is a requisite for successful work in the diocesan priesthood because the message of Christ is too important and vital a thing to handle carelessly or incompetently. It was Our Lord's will that His message should be given to the people exactly as He delivered it to His Church. To present this teaching erroneously is to deliver to the people for whom Our Lord died a mere imitation of His teaching. The man who preaches the word of God inaccurately takes the responsibility of telling people to believe, on the authority of God Himself, something which God has not said. He renders himself guilty of the offense of giving those actually in the Church and those called to membership in it a teaching opposed to Our Lord's own holy doctrine under the guise of divine revelation itself.

The man who presents the divine message equivocally or with ambiguity acts in such a way as to allow his hearers to be deceived or confused in their judgments about the faith of Jesus Christ. Carelessness in the presentation of Christian doctrine will almost inevitably occasion impurity and error in the faith of those who come under the influence of the offending teacher. And, even in those who are misled about the content of Christian doctrine through no fault of their own, the existence of error and confusion in the content of the faith is frightfully disadvantageous. The life of grace which Our Lord purchased for men by His death on Calvary finds its nourishment in the content of divine faith. The divine truth is tremendously important. Wretched indeed is the spiritual condition of the teacher of Catholic doctrine through whose carelessness the faith and the spiritual life of Christ's disciples suffer.

Thus the teaching on the need for learning in sacred doctrine within the *presbyterium* is far more than a mere pious sentiment. It is a statement of manifestly demonstrable theological truth. Because the flock of Jesus Christ requires and deserves adequate and accurate instruction in the faith, and because the only science in which the content of the faith is presented accurately and adequately is sacred theology itself, this discipline is absolutely requisite for the proper accomplishment of the diocesan priest's doctrinal mission. To deny

that the diocesan priesthood is constituted as a necessarily learned body is to fall into that naive snobbery that imagines that the poor and the little ones of Christ deserve nothing better than an amateurish and unscientifically prepared instruction in the faith of their Lord.

The doctrinal function of the *presbyterium,* however, is by no means the only factor that renders genuine theological learning a requisite in the diocesan priesthood. The diocesan priest has also essential sacrificial, sacramental, and administrative functions which demand theological competence on his part. In order to know what he is doing when he says Mass or administers the sacraments, he must have an accurate knowledge of what divine revelation tells us about these means of salvation. In order to aid the bishop in the direction of his flock, the diocesan priest must understand the divine teaching about the nature and the necessity of the *ecclesia.* Yet these sacramental, liturgical, and administrative motives for learning sacred theology have a primary reference to the spiritual life of the priest himself. The proper ordering of his life requires that he should have a genuine theological knowledge of the functions he performs as a member of the *presbyterium.* He needs his theology for teaching the word of God in order to safeguard, not merely his own faith, but that of the flock God has entrusted to the care of his bishop. Though by no means the only motive requiring the possession of theological learning by a secular priest, the essential doctrinal mission of the diocesan *presbyterium* is by far the most important one.

From a practical point of view we must hold it as perfectly certain that the diocesan priest does not and cannot satisfy the serious obligation God has placed upon him to acquire a high degree of theological learning merely by retaining the knowledge of the sacred science that he brings with him from the major seminary or the university. Sacred theology is a science that can be designated as truly supernatural, if we judge it from the point of view of the realities with which it deals. Considered, however, in the light of the way in which it is acquired and increased, it must be classified among the natural branches of human learning. Like any other naturally acquired science or discipline, sacred theology cannot be obtained apart from a rigorous and serious course of study. Furthermore a man must continue to study it seriously and intently if he is to retain this science and develop it within

himself so as to meet the demands of his position in the diocesan priesthood.

Anyone who considers the matter seriously and prayerfully will realize without too much difficulty that no man can perform the doctrinal work of the *presbyterium* if he fails to add very considerably to the theological equipment he brought with him into the priesthood. Like any other naturally acquired science, sacred theology will wither and die in the man who fails to cultivate it. Hence the priest who would fail to continue a serious study of sacred theology after his ordination would soon find himself deprived, through his own fault, of even the basic elements of his own professional science. Furthermore, only the most naive would ever be tempted to imagine that the amount of theology a man could learn in a seminary could possibly be sufficient doctrinal equipment for one who is called upon to preach the word of God.

After four years of seminary study, the young priest has been over each one of the central tracts of scholastic theology once. Due to the shortness of time (because four years is a short time to devote to a subject as complex as sacred theology), the seminarian receives an elementary, though accurate, instruction in each one of these tracts. In order to preach accurately and adequately to the people, he must make a further study of that particular section of sacred doctrine with which his sermon is concerned. Should a priest fail to make that extra study, he runs the tremendous risk of instructing his people incorrectly in the message of Christ through a guilty carelessness on his own part.

The late Pope Pius XI thus described the doctrinal requisites for priestly activity.

> The priest should have full grasp of the Catholic teaching on faith and morals; he should know how to present it to others; and he should be able to give the reasons for the dogmas, laws and observances of the Church of which he is minister. Profane sciences have indeed made much progress; but in religious questions there is still much ignorance still darkening the mind of our contemporaries. This ignorance the priest must dispel.[5]

In a letter to his diocesan priests of Geneva, St. Francis of Sales insisted upon the urgent necessity for superior theological knowl-

[5] The encyclical letter *Ad catholici sacerdotii*, issued on Dec. 20, 1935. The passage quoted is found on p. 39 of the NCWC translation.

edge within the *presbyterium.* He pointed to the terrible spiritual harm that had come to his own local Church when the enemies of the Catholic faith had found the secular priests "content to say our breviary without taking thought about making ourselves more learned."[6] He declared that the survival of the faith in his own locality had come in great measure from the learning of the Jesuits, who had supplied the defense of Catholicism which the diocesan priests themselves should have given. Having seen the harm that came to Catholics by reason of the failure of certain diocesan priests to acquire and use the theological learning demanded by their office, St. Francis spoke out sharply on the place of this science in his own priestly brotherhood.

> Priests who occupy themselves with works that take them away from study are like men who refuse their stomach the food it needs for nourishment. I tell you truthfully that there is no great difference between ignorance and malice, although ignorance is more to be feared, if you remember that by ignorance we not only suffer loss ourselves, but also bring men to despise the priesthood. I beg you then, my beloved brothers, to devote yourselves seriously to study because, for the priest, knowledge is the eighth sacrament of the ecclesiastical hierarchy, and the greatest evils have come to the Church by reason of the fact that the ark of knowledge has been found in hands other than those of the Levites . . . And, because divine Providence, without regard for my lack of capacity, has ordained me as your Bishop, I exhort you to study well, so that, being learned and of virtuous life, you may be without reproach and prepared to answer those who question you about the doctrines of the faith.[7]

The realistic and accurate teaching of St. Francis of Sales and of Pope Pius XI on the need for theological learning in order to do the work of sacerdotal ministry constitutes an effective principle of refutation to an unfortunate theory sometimes proposed in our own times. In the face of the fact that God has so formed His Church as to demand accurate and adequate preaching of the faith by the members of each diocesan *presbyterium* to the flock of Jesus

[6] The letter from which this and the following quotations are taken is printed in the *Vie de Saint François de Sales* by François Pérennès, contained in Migne's edition of the *Oeuvres complètes de S. François de Sales* (Paris, 1861), I, col. 557 f. It is also printed separately among the opuscula in the same edition, IV, col. 67 f.

[7] *Ibid.*

Christ in each local Church throughout His *ecclesia,* some men, more or less imbued with a distaste for the sacred science, occasionally assert that more than a modicum of theology in a priest is in some way a detriment to good preaching and effective instruction. We are warned that the trained theologian is bound to be "over the heads" of the people, and we are informed that the congregation will derive little fruit from a theologian's exposition of the word of God. What the men who propose this observation fear is not really science, but sciolism. They are justly afraid of the persons who prate endlessly of scholarship and learning without acutally possessing more than the barest rudiments of the subjects they are supposed to understand. People who employ technical and barbarous terminology in speaking to a congregation composed of persons who do not understand the words employed are never guilty of too much knowledge. Such a procedure constitutes the best possible evidence that the persons employing it have no scientific competence at all.

Actually the study of sacred theology by the priest will free him, once and for all, from the danger of inflicting upon his congregation such terms as "the formal object" and "the material object." The priest who applies himself to the study of the sacred science comes to see ever more perfectly the meaning of the message God has commissioned him to impart. Knowing the message itself, he finds no difficulty in presenting this body of truth to the people in a language they and he understand. Without that knowledge, he is prone to fall back on what he remembers of the terms of his old seminary recitations, anglicizing without translating the scholastic Latin words. Or, what is inexpressibly worse, he tends to shy away from the content of theology altogether, and make of his Sunday sermons little more than literate expressions of a soap-opera philosophy.

The best practical refutation of the canard that theological learning in some way detracts from a priest's effectiveness as a preacher of God's word is to be found in the record of eminent theologians who have distinguished themselves in bringing the divine truth to the people. Jean Charlier de Gerson, even though his teachings in ecclesiology were lamentably deficient, was still one of the most influential of the fifteenth century theologians. Yet, during the final twelve years of his life, "his chief occupation was the religious

formation of the children he gathered round him from the streets."[8] Among the champions of Christ who resisted the first onslaughts of Protestantism we find such men as St. Peter Canisius and William Estius outstanding both for the profundity of their theological acumen and the success of their preaching. St. Robert Bellarmine and Charles René Billuart are certainly best known as theologians, but both were preachers of exceptional competence and effectiveness. The great Bishop Jacques Bénigne Bossuet is rightly considered as one of the outstanding preachers in modern Church history, yet he is also numbered among the ablest theologians of his time. In our own era some of the best theological literature, even judged from a technical standpoint, is to be found in the printed sermons of such preachers as Fr. Janvier and Fr. Pinard de la Boullaye.

These theologians have been faithful preachers in the Catholic Church primarily because they were in a position to understand the place and the function of preaching in the company of Our Lord's disciples. They realized that it was their privilege and their responsibility to stand before the people of God and before the world as ambassadors of Christ, commissioned to expound His message, accurately and clearly. Their study of sacred theology rendered them competent to carry out the mandate God had given them through the orders of their religious superiors.

Their preaching truly was, as all preaching within the Church should certainly be, an expression of divine charity. They loved Our Lord far too much to take the risk of misinterpreting His teaching. Their affection and reverence for the *ecclesia,* the household of God, were far too great to let them run the chance of feeding the little ones of Christ with something other than the pure bread of His doctrine. Basically, their attitude towards theological studies could be summed up in the prayer of Francis Sylvus, for they shared with him the true humility sacred theology gives to those who study it faithfully and ardently. Fr. Norbert D'Elbecque tells us that the Douai master used to offer this petition to God each time he opened his books of theology.

Lord, this vilest of Thy servants, one unworthy of any good, wishes to enter in to see Thy treasures. May it please Thee to let him in, all unworthy as he is. Grant that, in this sacred reading, he may learn to

[8] Hughes, *A History of the Church* (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1947) III, 453.

love Thee as much as to know Thee; because, O Lord God my Creator, I will not know Thee except to love Thee.[9]

The diocesan bishop empowers the members of his *presbyterium* to preach the word of God, and nothing else, to the people for whom he is responsible to Christ Our Lord. The man who has the spirit of the diocesan priesthood needs no encouragement to apply himself to the science of sacred theology in order to make himself competent to teach this divine message correctly. The man who is aware of his responsibilities as a diocesan priest will not be greatly concerned with the reputation he may or may not acquire as pulpit orator. He knows that it is his God-given function in the Church of God, not to entertain but to instruct the people in the teaching of Jesus Christ. His central interest will inevitably be focussed upon the means available to him for the correct and faithful presentation of Our Lord's message. This study of sacred theology is the great and necessary means to this end.

In order to see the divinely constituted function of the diocesan priesthood in its proper light, we must realize that there is no substitute for the work of sacred theology. Definitely not all of the Catholic books on Catholic doctrine or on the Church are such as to give the priest the instruction he needs in order to preach the revealed word of God as Christ wills that he should preach it. Thus, within the lifetime of our own generation, a certain number of lay Catholics have felt impelled to publish their observations on Catholic life and teaching. All of these books speak confidently, some of them interestingly, about the realm of divine faith. Very few of them, however, can justly claim the title of theological treatises.

The man who recognizes the theological truth that the diocesan priesthood is actually and necessarily a learned body in the Catholic Church is in a position to see the fatal effects that follow from a practical rejection of this thesis. The people who have imagined that the secular priesthood is not, and need not be a particularly learned body have arrived at their strange conclusion from a belief that the Catholic body itself, the *plebs Dei* under the direction of the diocesan bishop and his *presbyterium,* stands in no special need of profound instruction in the divine faith. Paradoxically, in an age when a highly complicated technical knowledge has been com-

[9] In the *Vitae compendium* by D'Elbecque, for the *Opera omnia* of Sylvius (Antwerp, 1698), V, x.

monplace, far too many Catholic writers have devoted all of their efforts to the task of "simplifying" the presentation of Catholic truth. While the Communists have had confidence enough in the intellectual capacity of their victims to instruct them in the complexities of Marxist and Leninist ideology, some proponents of Christ's truth have shown themselves hideously afraid that Catholics might not receive their intellectual nourishment on a low enough level. They have been so frightened by the possibility of "talking over the heads of the people" that they have run dangerously close to confusing and disedifying the disciples of Christ by the infantile level of their instruction.

The poisonous practice of instructing congregations of grown men and women as if they were school children in the fifth grade is, like the habit of constructing sermons for what is thought to be literary elegance rather than for theological accuracy, a resultant of an erroneous belief that the world and the Church do not need accurate and theological exposition of divine supernatural revelation. It is precisely because the people need this correct preaching of God's word that the *presbyterium,* which is divinely constituted to aid the bishop in teaching, sanctifying, and ruling the Church of Christ, is by divine institution a learned body.

JOSEPH CLIFFORD FENTON

The Catholic University of America,
Washington, D. C.

PRAYER OF THE PRIEST

Prayer lifts the mind to God and unites us to Him. Prayer must be uninterrupted in the sense that it maintains us always in close union with God. It must be accompanied by thanksgiving. If this duty of thanksgiving binds all the faithful, then with still greater reason does it extend to the priest. In the genuine sense of the term, his life is Eucharistic. Through the power conferred on him in ordination, he consecrates the Holy Eucharist—and "Eucharist" means "the giving of thanks." Our Lord gave thanks to the Father when He instituted the Blessed Sacrament; the Mass is the most perfect expression of gratitude to God.

—Most Reverend Amleto Giovanni Cicognani, Archbishop of Laodicea and Apostolic Delegate to the United States, in *The Priest in the Epistles of St. Paul* (Paterson, N. J.: St. Anthony Guild Press, 1944), p. 19.

Answers to Questions

THE FUNERAL ABSOLUTION ON GREAT FEASTS

Question: On the feast of the Epiphany, is it permitted to have a funeral, bringing the body to the church and having the Mass of the day said in white vestments and then, changing the vestments to black ones, performing the absolution of the body?

Answer: In virtue of a special rescript of the Sacred Congregation of Rites (Oct. 16, 1940) it is now permitted to say funeral Masses of Requiem, *praesente corpore,* on all feasts of the first class with the exception of the six feasts of precept and the feasts of the Epiphany and Corpus Christi. Naturally, the *Triduum Sanctum* of Holy Week is likewise excluded.

Legislation of the Sacred Congregation of an earlier date forbids burial services in the church on feasts of the first class unless the body is not brought to the church for the absolution until the afternoon, after the time of Vespers, when solemnities of the feast have been concluded. It is further provided that on such occasions the bell is not to be tolled (S.R.C., Jan. 27, 1883, no. 3570 *ad 1).* Applying this ruling to the case in question, evidently it would not be proper to bring the body to the church for the Mass of the day, the absolution immediately following. If the funeral cannot be postponed to the next day, the correct procedure would be to have the services after the middle of the afternoon, omitting the tolling of the bell. For the United States, this prohibition affects, not all feasts of the first class, but only the six days of precept and the feasts of the Epiphany and Corpus Christi.

HOLY COMMUNION AT FUNERAL MASSES

Question: Is the distribution of Holy Communion at a funeral Mass officially prohibited? I have never seen it done. Is this a matter of custom or of legislation?

Answer: That Holy Communion is not distributed at funeral Masses is a matter of custom, not of legislation. The celebration of Mass carries with it also the distribution of Holy Communion. The

reception of the Sacrament of the Blessed Eucharist is the chief form of participation of the laity in the Sacrifice of the Mass. It was at one time thought that it was incongruous to administer Holy Communion when the priest was wearing black vestments. If there is no incongruity in the celebration of Mass in black vestments, *a fortiori,* there is none in distributing Holy Communion at a Requiem Mass. Fortescue *(The Mass,* p. 372) accounts for the omission of the Pax at Masses for the dead because they were originally private Masses without the communion of the people. Perhaps our custom of not distributing Holy Communion at funeral Masses, though we do so at other Requiem Masses, is a survival of this old idea.

MONTH'S MIND AND ANNIVERSARY MASSES

Question: What Requiem Mass should be said for the second Month's Mind, for the third, etc.? Again, what Mass is proper for the second and third and subsequent anniversaries? Is the *Dies irae* to be said only at the first Month's Mind and the first anniversary or it is proper also for the following ones?

Answer: What is popularly known as the Month's Mind Mass is officially the Mass on the thirtieth day following the death or burial of the deceased person for whom it is offered. Hence, there is no second or third or subsequent Month's Mind Mass as there is only one thirtieth day after decease or burial. The Mass to be said on this first "Month's Mind" is that provided in the Missal for the *dies obitus seu depositionis,* in which only the orations are changed to suit it for the third, seventh, or thirtieth day following the death or funeral.

The case of the anniversary Mass is different. The word, anniversary, both in English and in its Latin equivalent, is not restricted to the first annual recurrence of the day of death or burial but extends to subsequent annual commemorations of the departed. So, the Mass in the Missal, *In anniversario defunctorum,* is to be said not only on the first anniversary of the death of a person but also on all following anniversaries.

The *Dies irae* is of obligation in all Masses of Requiem, except the *Missa quotidiana,* and it must be said even in this when it is a High Mass or a Solemn Mass.

MASS OF A LESSER FEAST IN OCCURRENCE

Question: The Ordo for April 30, 1947 gave the priest the choice of saying either the Mass of the office of the day, which is that of the octave of St. Joseph, a major double, with a commemoration of St. Catherine, the feast regularly assigned to April 30, or the Mass of St. Catherine, with a commemoration of St. Joseph. This seems to contradict the rules for "Occurrence" found in the table in the front of the Breviary.

Answer: It is true that under the general rules governing the "occurrence" of feasts which fall on the same day, the *festum dignius* takes precedence. So the octave day of the Solemnity of St. Joseph being of the rank of *duplex majus* is preferred with reference to the feast of St. Catherine, a *duplex minus*. This holds absolutely for the divine office. For the Mass, however, a special provision of the rubrics in the section in front of the Missal, entitled *Additiones et variationes (Tit.* IV, 4), gives a priest the option of saying the Mass of any feast of double (major or minor) or semidouble rank, when, because of a conflict such as that cited by our questioner, it is impeded by a feast of greater dignity. It is provided, however, that this may not be done when the impeding feast is a double of the first or second class, or the conflicting Mass is that of a Sunday, even one anticipated or merely "reposed," or when the office of higher grade is a day within a privileged octave of the first or second order, or the octave day of any privileged octave, or one of the privileged ferias or vigils.

A similar choice is given the celebrant of Low Mass on all weekdays during Lent, on the Ember Days, on the Monday of the Rogation Days, and on all the common vigils. On these days the Mass of the feria or the vigil may be said instead of that of the feast of the day, provided the latter be not a *duplex primae aut secundae classis*. This allows the ferial Mass to be said *ad libitum celebrantis* throughout Lent, except on the feasts of St. Matthias, St. Joseph, the Annunciation, and any special feasts which are locally of the same rank.

THE MANNER OF SAYING THE PRAYERS AFTER LOW MASS

Question: The prayers ordered by Leo XIII to be said after Low Mass should, as I understand it, be said "by the priest with

the people." The people answer the priest with the second part of the "Hail Mary" and, in many places, recite the "Hail, Holy Queen," along with him. Should they not continue and say with him the two prayers which follow?

Answer: Since these prayers do not belong to the liturgy, in the strict sense of that term, in the absence of any definite directions of the Sovereign Pontiff who prescribed simply that they be recited "with the people," we conclude that legitimate custom is the norm to be followed in executing this direction. The usual custom is the one which is described by our correspondent. There would certainly be no objection to the joining of the voices of the congregation to that of the priest, not only for the "Hail, Holy Queen," but also for the subsequent prayers and this, too, would be a more literal interpretation of the words of Leo XIII.

MEANING OF THE RAISING OF THE CHASUBLE AT THE ELEVATION

In answer to a query in the issue of last December *(AER,* CXV, 6, 462), we remarked that although the raising of the chasuble by the server (or the deacon) at the elevations served no practical purpose and had no symbolic meaning, nevertheless it was still to be performed as it is directed by the rubrics of the Missal. A priest from the Philippines recalls that he was taught as a boy that holding the chasuble by the minister at this sublime moment is an expression of the close connection between the priest and the faithful. We are grateful to our correspondent for calling our attention to this symbolic aspect of the ceremony. Our own mind was focused on the fact that originally some practical purpose was served by this action, the minister sustaining some of the weight when chasubles were all-enveloping and hence impeded the execution of the raising aloft of the Sacred Species. In this connection, we may remark that in certain monastic rites, for example, that of the Carthusians, the server is directed to hold up the hem of the chasuble when the priest turns to the people to say the *Orate fratres,* thus indicating unity between celebrant and congregation in the intentions of the Sacrifice. A similar practice is that of the Dominicans when the deacon raises the celebrant's chasuble as the latter salutes the faithful with *Dominus vobiscum.* The Premonstratentians have the deacon kiss the front of the priest's vestment when

the *Dominus vobiscum* is sung at High Mass. All these customs are no doubt symbols of unity between priest and people as is our own practice of raising the chasuble at the elevations.

TITULAR FEAST OF A CHURCH OF ST. MARY

Question: Our church is called simply St. Mary's. Which feast of the Blessed Virgin is to be considered as our patronal feast and hence celebrated as a double of the first class with an octave?

Answer: We should remark that strictly speaking a distinction is made between the patron and the titular of a church or place. The patron of a locality is the saint selected as its special advocate and the choice must be ratified by the Holy See. The titular is the Divine Person, or sacred mystery, or angel or saint in whose name the church, or other place, is blessed or consecrated and by whose name it is known. Evidently, in the question proposed it is the titular who is the subject of the enquiry. The Sacred Congregation of Rites has decided (No. 2529, ad 1 et 2) that where the titular of a church is the Blessed Virgin Mary without any designation of any of her special titles, the feast of the Assumption is to be celebrated as the titular feast. Hence, St. Mary's church will observe Aug. 15th as its titular feast. This festival being a *duplex primae classis cum octava* in the universal Church, the parish in question will follow the usual ordo in the liturgical observance of its name day.

THE OFFICE OF A *TONSURATUS* AT HIGH MASS

Question: May a tonsured cleric who assists at High Mass *(Missa cantata)* perform any functions beyond those usually done by altar boys, except the singing of the Epistle?

Answer: A *Missa cantata* may be regarded as a Low Mass with music by the choir and chant by the celebrant or a Solemn Mass, sung without the assistance of deacon and subdeacon. It may be given a degree of solemnity by the attendance of one or several clerics either in sacred or minor orders. If the assisting cleric is merely tonsured, he may sing the Epistle and, in addition to the ceremonies ordinarily performed by the altar boys, he may carry the chalice from the credence tables to the altar at the Offertory

and take it back after the ablutions and also attend the celebrant at the book unless other duties call him from the side of the priest, as when he has to minister the cruets. If the cleric assisting is in sacred orders, he may, besides performing the services indicated above, present the paten and host and later the chalice to the priest for the oblations of the same and pour in the wine and water at the Offertory and cleanse the chalice and dress it after the ablutions. In general, the cleric *in sacris* acts very much as the chaplain assisting the bishop at Low Mass. The *tonsuratus,* however, is restricted to the singing of the Epistle and carrying the chalice to and from the altar. Otherwise, there is no difference between his assistance and that of an altar-boy. We may remark that there is no objection to employing the latter to assist at the book throughout the Mass if he is sufficiently well instructed in this function (cf. Baldeschi, *Le sacre cerimonie,* pp. 166 ff.).

WILLIAM J. LALLOU

CHEATING A SLOT MACHINE

Question: A slot machine is kept in a public place in defiance of state law. One of the patrons uses fraudulent means (a coin with a string attached) in playing the machine. What are the obligations regarding restitution which a confessor should impose on this person?

Answer: Although it is not quite clear from the question what is the particular efficacy of the device employed by the patron—namely, whether it makes the machine discharge a flock of dividends which otherwise would not flow, or insures the return of the patron's coin so that he can play with the same coin repeatedly—the latter seems to be the purpose. In any event, the winnings are unjust, since one of the essential conditions for the contract of *ludus* is lacking, a fair chance to win on the part of both contestants. In the present case the patron is sure to win eventually, the machine is sure to lose; for in each individual play the patron actually stakes nothing. Hence, restoration of the winnings must be made. *Per se* this restitution should be made to those who own the machine; but on account of the difficulty of finding out who these persons are, the great probability that money directed to the owners (if they are found) will be stolen by underlings before it gets to them, etc., the practical course

would be to make restitution to the poor or to pious causes. The fact that the operation of the machine is against the state law does not enter into this particular case, since a person is no more justified by this fact in stealing from the machine than a person is justified in stealing money or goods from a liquor store conducted in defiance of the law in a prohibition state.

One possible exception should be noted. If it is sure that a substantial portion of the money in the machine has been unjustly acquired by the owners (e.g. by "fixing" the machine so that the chances of beating the customer are beyond a fair proportion) the winner in the case we are considering could regard some of the money he acquires as the property of persons who have been cheated and can no longer be found, and could retain this portion of his winnings, as he could a lost article which he picks up, without any probability of finding the owner. But it would be difficult to estimate just what proportion of the winnings has been unjustly gained by the owner of the machine.

HEARING MASS OVER THE RADIO

Question: I have been informed that a Catholic who is so physically handicapped that he cannot go to church can fulfil his obligation of Sunday Mass and share in all the benefits of the Holy Sacrifice by listening devoutly to a Mass broadcast over the radio. Can we make this statement to the patients of a hospital where a loud-speaking system has been installed in every room, so that the patients can follow the Mass that is being celebrated in the chapel?

Answer: As far as the fulfilment of the obligation of Sunday Mass is concerned, one does not comply with it by hearing a broadcast of the sacred function over the radio. The fulfilment of this obligation requires physical presence at the Holy Sacrifice, or at least conjunction with the group actually present (e.g. in the case where the crowd is so great that it reaches beyond the doors of the church). Of course, this is a matter that depends on the legislative enactments of the Church. The Pope could decree that the obligation is fulfilled by listening devotedly to a broadcast, just as he has ruled that one may gain the indulgence of the papal blessing over the radio (*AAS*, XXXI [1939], 277). I have heard it stated that during the civil war in Spain the Holy Father announced that the Catholics of that country could

satisfy their Sunday obligation by hearing Mass over the radio. But, as far as I know, there has been no general concession to this effect.

As to the particular case presented by the questioner, it is possible that there is sufficient conjunction between the hospital rooms and the chapel to provide the patients with the required physical presence, particularly if the hospital is small, and the rooms are on the same corridor as the chapel. But, even in that event, the patients should not be given the impression that by merely listening to a broadcast Mass they fulfil their obligation. Some of them would doubtless carry this erroneous impression with them after their discharge from the hospital, if the matter were not clearly explained.

It should be emphasized, however, that one may participate in the benefits of the Mass without being actually present—namely, by directing one's intention and devotion to the sacred rite. By hearing Mass over the radio one can certainly foster his devotion, and thus profit considerably from the offering of the Holy Sacrifice. Indeed, it could happen that one who participates in the Holy Sacrifice in this manner will gain much more benefit than many of those who are actually present.

FRANCIS J. CONNELL, C.SS.R.

TRUE LIBERTY

It is manifest that the eternal law of God is the sole standard and rule of human liberty, not only in each individual man, but also in the community and civil society which men constitute when united. Therefore, the true liberty of human society does not consist in every man doing what he pleases, for this would simply end in turmoil and confusion, and bring on the overthrow of the State; but rather in this, that through the injunctions of the civil law all may more easily conform to the prescriptions of the eternal law. Likewise, the liberty of those who are in authority does not consist in the power to lay unreasonable and capricious commands upon their subjects, which would equally be criminal and would lead to the ruin of the commonwealth; but the binding force of human laws is in this, that they are to be regarded as applications of the eternal law.

—Pope Leo XIII in *Libertas praestantissimum,* June 20, 1888 *(The Great Encyclical Letters of Pope Leo XIII* [New York: Benziger Brothers, 1903], p. 142).

Analecta

The most important document in the last number of the *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* for 1946 is probably the allocution of our Holy Father delivered to the delegates attending the convention of the Italian Federation of Farmers. This allocution, delivered Nov. 15, 1946,[1] might well have been cast in the form of an encyclical because its message is of primary importance not only for the farmers of Italy but for the farmers of the whole world. Indeed, its significance for the whole economic, social, and political structure of all nations can hardly be overemphasized.

The allocution stresses in succinct form the reasons that should prompt all to hold agriculture in high esteem, particularly the facility it offers for the promotion of a life in harmony with the highest moral principles and with the demands of religion regarding man's obligations to his family, to his neighbor and to God. It points to the conflict between urban life and rural life and analyzes its reasons, fundamental among which is the diversity of the underlying concepts of the relations of capital and labor. The point of view of the city is that labor should serve capital; that of the rural community is that capital should serve labor, i.e. that material things should be subject to the direction of the man who employs them rather than that the man should be subject to the material things he employs.

Our Holy Father warned the delegates that they must not consider their interests as adverse to the public welfare, but as an element contributing to the promotion of public prosperity. He also insisted on the necessity of education for the farmer's children, not only in their spiritual obligations but also in secular subjects and particularly those affecting the cultivation of the land. The allocution closes with the Apostolic Benediction.

Of comparable significance is the allocution which our Holy Father delivered on Nov. 21, 1946,[2] to the delegates attending the International Congress of Philosophy. In it our Holy Father points to the similarity of the mission of the philosopher with his own, the common element consisting in the propagation of the truth and the application of it to the world of practical affairs. He notes the frag-

[1] *Acta Apostolicae Sedis*, XXXVIII (1946), 432. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 426.

mentary nature of excessive specialization and praises philosophy for its synthesizing function, a function that tends to satisfy the human heart craving to see the universe not only in its particular items but in its universality. He observes that the Congress, in referring to Existentialism, had called it the philosophy of disaster and had recognized as its effects a religious voluntarism and an opposition to intellectualism through a pessimistic irrationalism. The perennial philosophy, he avers, with God as the key to will and mind, effects a union of both, of a clear understanding and of a strong will based on it. Without God, he asks, is not a philosophy of despair, like Existentialism, inevitable? Our Holy Father tells the delegates of the pleasure their presence has given him and closes the allocution with the Apostolic Benediction.

Five letters of our Holy Father are reported in this number of the *Acta*. One, dated June 21, 1946,[3] addressed to Most Rev. Michael O'Doherty, Archbishop of Manila, was written to lend his blessing to the Marian Congress held to celebrate the third centenary of the naval victory obtained through the intercession of the Blessed Virgin as a result of the recitation of the Rosary. In this letter our Holy Father adverts to the catastrophe that war brought to the Philippines, noting that in the destruction of the Church of St. Dominic in Manila, the statue of the Blessed Virgin of the Rosary was left unscathed. He points to this as an encouraging prophecy of the aid that Mary will give the Islands, through the Rosary, in their material and spiritual reconstruction.

A second letter, dated Oct. 23, 1946,[4] is that sent to Very Rev. Augustine Gemelli, O.F.M., to congratulate him as Rector on the twenty-fifth anniversary of the founding of the Catholic University of the Sacred Heart in Milan. It points to the achievements of the past, notably the reconstruction of new buildings following the destruction of old ones as an incident of the war, and emphasizes the fact that the hope aroused by these past accomplishments must be realized.

A third letter, dated Oct. 11, 1946,[5] is that approving the statutes of Italian Catholic Action, sent to His Eminence, Adeodato Giovanni Piazza, Patriarch of Venice, and President of the Episcopal Committee of Italy for Catholic Action, under whose supervision the statutes were prepared. The letter was sent on the occasion of

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 417. [4] *Ibid.*, p. 424. [5] *Ibid.*, p. 422.

the twentieth Social Week of Italian Catholics holding its sessions in Venice.

A fourth letter, dated Sept. 8, 1946,[6] is that appointing as Papal Legate for the Plenary Council of Chile His Eminence, José M. Caro Rodriguez, Archbishop of Santiago.

The four letters close with the Apostolic Benediction, as does the fifth, which authorizes His Eminence, Giovanni Battista Nasalli Rocca di Corneliano, Archbishop of Bologna, as Papal Legate, to confer the Apostolic Blessing with a plenary indulgence attached after the Pontifical Mass celebrated on the occasion of the transfer of the relics of St. Dominic from the crypt in which they had been placed for safety during the war. This letter is dated Aug. 4 (the Feast of St. Dominic), 1946.[7]

A constitution of Jan. 5, 1946,[8] establishes a cathedral chapter in the Diocese of Aguas Calientes, Mexico, and another, dated Jan. 11, 1946, establishes a Prefecture Apostolic in Peru under the title of St. Francis Xavier, from territory taken from the Diocese of Chachapoyas and Cajamarca and from the Vicariate Apostolic of St. Gabriel of the Sorrowful Virgin of Marañon.[9]

Two decrees of the Sacred Congregation of Rites provide for the introduction of causes of servants of God: one, dated Feb. 8, 1946,[10] is in favor of Mercedes of Jesus Molina, Foundress of the Sisters of the Blessed Maria Anna of Jesus; the other, dated July 12, 1946,[11] is in favor of Meinrad Eugster, a Benedictine lay brother. Another decree of the Sacred Congregation of Rites, dated May 26, 1946,[12] declares the proof of two miracles wrought after her beatification through the intercession of Blessed Catherine Labouré, a Daughter of Charity, to whom the Blessed Virgin appeared and showed the Miraculous Medal, and who wrought many cures through the Medal during her lifetime.

A decree of the Sacred Consistorial Congregation, dated Aug. 11, 1945,[13] changes the boundaries of the Archdioceses of Acerenza and Matera. Under date of Dec. 7, 1946,[14] are reported the appointments of Most Rev. Albert L. Fletcher, D.D., to the See of Little Rock, and of Most Rev. Aloysius Willinger, D.D., as Titular Bishop of Bida and Coadjutor with the right of succession of

[6] *Ibid.*, p. 421.
[7] *Ibid.*, p. 420.
[8] *Ibid.*, p. 413.
[9] *Ibid.*, p. 416.
[10] *Ibid.*, p. 440.
[11] *Ibid.*, p. 445.
[12] *Ibid.*, p. 443.
[13] *Ibid.*, p. 438.
[14] *Ibid.*, p. 439.

Most Rev. Philip Scher, D.D., Bishop of Monterey-Fresno. Under date of July 30, 1946,[15] the Sacred Congregation for the Oriental Church reports the appointment of Most Rev. Daniel Ivancho, D.D., as Titular Bishop of Europo and Coadjutor with the right of succession of Most Rev. Basil Takach, D.D., Apostolic Exarch in the United States for the Ruthenians of the Byzantine Rite from Podcarpathia.

Recent Pontifical Appointments Announced in the *Acta Apostolicae Sedis*

Domestic Prelates of His Holiness:

Sept. 29, 1945: Rt. Rev. Msgrs. Michael Steines, Casimir Piejda, and Edward P. Buttimer, of the Diocese of Syracuse.

Oct. 13, 1945: Rt. Rev. Msgrs. Daniel Francis Curtin and David C. Gildea, of the Diocese of Syracuse.

Oct. 20, 1945: Rt. Rev. Msgrs. George D. Mulcahy of the Diocese of Harrisburg; and Thomas V. Shannon, Richard J. Patterson, Wenceslaus F. Novak, Leo O. Hamer, Albert J. Murphy, George A. Whitehead, Joseph J. Mullen, and Vincent B. Balmat, of the Diocese of Cleveland.

Oct. 21, 1945: Rt. Rev. Msgrs. Bernard J. Flanagan, John B. McGarry, Damas Carrieres, Eugene F. Cray, Charles L. Pontbriand, George E. L'Ecuyer, Joseph A. Dame, James P. Rand, William P. Crosby, and John M. Brown, of the Diocese of Burlington.

Nov. 21, 1945: Rt. Rev. Msgrs. Leo M. Byrnes, William J. Cusick, and John Canepa, of the Diocese of Mobile.

Dec. 13, 1945: Rt. Rev. Msgrs. John J. Sprangers, Julius Chylinski, John J. Loerke, Julius J. Looze, Henry J. Ehr, Michael Klosowski, and Claude V. Hugo, of the Diocese of Green Bay.

Dec. 21, 1945: Rt. Rev. Msgrs. William P. Joyce, Francis X. O'Farrell, Denis P. Meade, James G. Tougas, Emmet J. Riley, and John B. Pirnat, of the Diocese of Helena; Bernard Hilgenberg and Albert R. Zuroweste, of the Diocese of Belleville; Lucian L. Bojnowski, Denis L. Gleason, and John J. Hayes, of the Diocese of Hartford.

Jerome D. Hannan

The Catholic University of America,
Washington, D. C.

[15] *Ibid.*, p. 440.

Book Reviews

LA RENUNCIA ALL' UFFICIO ECCLESIASTICO NELLA STORIA DEL DIRITTO CANONICO DALLA ETA' APOSTOLICA ALLA RIFORMA CATTOLICA. By Pier Giovanni Caron. Milano: Universitá cattolica del Sacro Cuore; Saggie e ricerche: Societá editrice "Vita e Pensiero," 1946. Pp. xviii + 413.

This volume is published under the auspices of the Catholic University of the Sacred Heart, Milan, Italy. Its value consists primarily in a contribution to the study of the development of the canonical institute of renunciation of office. Coupled with this primary utility is the value arising from a disquisition on the general history of the Church.

The author divides his work into three almost equal parts. The first part, which covers the period from the Apostolic age to the Decree of Gratian, furnishes the concepts and foundations in law relative to renunciation of office. These points are thoroughly investigated. The Councils of the Church and the Acts of the Popes and of the Doctors of the Church are carefully scrutinized for every item which could contribute toward a complete delineation of an ecclesiastical office and its renunciation. Much of the material used by the author clearly sets apart the concept of renunciation of office from other ways in which an office can be ceded or lost. Various cases are discussed in which the elements of renunciation are exposed and expounded. Attention is called to the doctrine of St. Gregory the Great which demanded acceptance on the part of a superior before renunciation could be valid.

The second part considers renunciation of office from the Decree of Gratian to the Great Schism. This was the period when Canon Law was most thoroughly developed in the appropriate letters and decretals of the Popes and the monumental commentaries of the Decretists and Decretalists.

The author stresses the importance of the Decree of Gratian in the history of renunciation of office. There is a fine discussion of the causes and motives for renunciation. Gratian himself adds considerably to the clarity of the doctrine as it was received in his day. His *dicta* are exceptionally lucid. Especially is this so in the difference between external persecution and bad will of subjects as a cause for renunciation.

Additional stress is laid in this period on the necessity of acceptance of renunciation. This stress is built upon the doctrine of St. Gregory the Great but it seeks principally to exclude all but legitimate ecclesiastical Superiors from accepting renunciations. The abuse, especially in Germany, of renouncing an ecclesiastical office into the hands of laymen is strictly and constantly fought by Gratian.

The author correctly states that renunciation of office is better systematized in the decretals. There a definite, if only practical, distinction is made between renunciation and resignation of office. The latter term began to be used by the Roman Curia to denote a specific kind of renunciation, viz., *in favorem tertii*. Much sad abuse resulted from this kind of renunciation. In the decretals, too, is worked out the distinction between renunciation of an office limited to the locality and one embracing both locality and dignity. In a word, the decretals furnish the corner-stone for the law pertinent to renunciation of office as it is found today in the Code of Canon Law.

Pope Boniface VIII settled the disputed point whether a Pope could renounce his office. The author discusses the reasons upon which this Pontiff based his law as well as the contentions which a predecessor, Pope Innocent III, offered for the contrary opinion. The author is not satisfied with the reasons of either side.

It must be remembered that this point was a burning question at the time of Pope Boniface VIII. It was not merely political. The element of acceptance as an essential item in renunciation was endangered if the Pope could renounce his office. The Pope has no Superior on earth. Who, then, could accept his renunciation? The law of Pope Boniface VIII was received by most and challenged by some. Commentators on the law of the Pope defended it on the score that since the element of acceptance was impossible in the case of papal renunciation the Pope was not bound by it. This was thoroughly in accord with the Rules of Law.

During this period, too, the concepts of automatic renunciation and tacit renunciation were developed by the commentators, among whom should be mentioned Hostiensis, Joannes Andreas and Goffredus de Trano.

The third part of the work continues the study of renunciation of office to the Council of Trent. It cannot be denied that the admirable law of the decretals was ignored in many places and abuses, serious and continuing, afflicted the Church in regard to benefices and offices in general. The Council of Trent put an effective and definite stop to most of these abuses in so far as they referred to renunciation of office. The capacity, for instance, of the incumbent in office was carefully determined relative to his right to renounce his office. Similarly, the effects of renunciation were determined in detail.

Adequate praise must be given to the author of this volume for his painstaking work in presenting the development of the canonical institute of renunciation of office. No adverse criticism can be made of his method in general or of his manner of citation. Worthy also of commendation is the concise summary of the volume at the end of the book.

Advanced students of the history of Canon Law will find this volume of the utmost value.

However, were it not for an unusually detailed table of contents students less advanced would find this volume almost impossible to use. This is the result of the absolute lack of indices. No index at all is provided. Further editions should remedy this real defect. A list also of pertinent papal Acts is suggested. The bibliography must be gathered from the generous footnotes. No list is provided. This defect, too, should be corrected.

EDWARD ROELKER

UNDER THE RED SUN. By Forbes J. Monaghan, S.J. New York: The Declan X. McMullen Co., 1946. Pp. 279. $2.75.

This book is presented as a "letter from Manila" reporting the experiences of the author during the period of the Japanese occupation of the Philippines. How the noble soul of the people of the Philippines rose against the oppressor is the theme of the book and in presenting it the author has created an extremely readable account of what happens to little people when their country is over-run. Historians may deal with events in a cold, detached manner, but the chronicler takes us down into the minds and hearts of those whose life, whose honor, and whose Faith, were at stake.

America may have been blind to the threats which were poised against the Islands, and great leaders may have bungled the preparations for defense, but it had been big enough to promise freedom to the people of the Islands and this awoke in their hearts the greatness to resist when it looked as if the Americans who had been driven out would be a long time coming back, if ever they did.

The reader sitting comfortably in his home may find it hard to realize that things such as are reported here could happen to people today, that there could be the searches, captures, tortures, escapes which must have become commonplace to those who were part of the underground. The people who follow each other across the pages of this account probably thought them impossible, too, until they were tossed into the maelstrom and found themselves battling to keep themselves and their country from going under.

Only one who had lived with the people for a long time and who knew them well and understood them could write so moving an account of what they did when they were put to the test. This is no report of one who went in to get a story. It is rather a story straight-told by one who was in the struggle himself.

THOMAS OWEN MARTIN

THE HOLY FAMILY. By Rev. Denis O'Shea, C.C. Dublin: M. H. Gill and Son, Ltd., 1944. Pp. xii + 224. $2.00.

Any excursion into the life and times of Christ is almost assured of interested followers. If the author goes into detail and reveals tiny touches of intimate background, the following grows. If he adds that detail with some regard for the facts in the matter, we have something that may respectably be referred to and consulted with some degree of security.

Fr. O'Shea follows the Holy Family from the night of Christ's birth to the occasion of the Finding in the Temple. In the course of enlarging upon the meager Scriptural information about those years, he introduces much that is authentic about the times of Christ and the religious, political, and social circumstances that surrounded the Holy Family.

The author makes proper and discriminating use of the Apocrypha in adding to the line and color of his work. There should be, however, careful note made of the fact that the Apocrypha are valid evidence only insofar as they reflect the beliefs extant during the time of their actual composition. While the author does carefully note his use of apocryhal works, he sometimes runs them together with Spiritual references or historical fact. For the reader who does not distinguish the relative values of the evidences offered, this may result in a confused belief that all of these works are of equally reliable authority.

This book does have solid worth, and is recommended on that score. It is far superior in erudition to some contemporary efforts that attempt to enliven and enlighten later periods in the life of Christ.

PATRICK O'BRIEN, C.M.

A GUIDE TO HISTORICAL METHOD. By Gilbert J. Garraghan, S.J. Edited by Jean Delanglez, S.J. New York: Fordham University Press, 1946. Pp. xv + 482 + 30. $4.50.

There has been a real need for a satisfactory manual on historical method. Those that we have are either in foreign languages or cover only part of the ground. And most of the modern ones are written from the viewpoint of a naturalistic philosophy incompatible with Christianity. In the practical working of limited topics this usually makes little difference since Catholic scholars accept the same careful and strict rules of criticism as others; the difference becomes more serious when dealing with the synthesis and interpretation of the large movements of history. So we welcome a book which is at once firmly Christian and strictly scholarly in method.

The late Fr. Garraghan has written on a large scale and has produced more than a textbook. The ordinary topics are covered, technical rules and practical advice are given for the true understanding of the documents that are to be used as source material, and for the construction out of them of a finished piece of historical writing. In addition, sections are devoted to more philosophical matters such as the nature of historical truth and the philosophy of history. Throughout there is an abundance of illustrative material and references for further reading. Here the author's choice has been guided by the fact that an increasing majority of American students are studying American and modern European history, and examples are taken predominantly from these fields. Everywhere we find the author's good judgment and the fruit of real experience.

In its main lines the book is a great success, but unfortunately not so much can be said for all the details. Probably because of Fr. Garraghan's premature death it seems to have been compiled from notes without sufficient care. An effort has been made to sort material into paragraphs in large and small type and of varying indentation; yet the assortment is not always careful, and the effect to a continuous reader is a bit annoying and confusing. Many places would be improved if the main text were given a fuller and smoother treatment at the expense of the subsidiary paragraphs. Also some rearrangements are desirable; in some cases a theme is briefly discussed in various places from different angles but nowhere in an integrated way (thus "Historismus" on pp. 336 f., and 370). Some parts are too brief to be useful (e.g., the sketch history of historical writing, pp. 59 ff.); the chapter on auxiliary sciences certainly cries out for fuller development.

More serious is the carelessness of the references and examples. Some references are insufficient for proper identification (to the *MGH* on pp. 199, 300), and some are erroneous (to an article by Powicke, p. 311; to *Speculum*, p. 137). Out-of-date editions are cited; there are misprints that result in confusion in the text (1694 for 1494, p. 270; the date 1925, p. 249). Various mistakes have crept into some of the examples (Baker of "Swinkind" for Swinbrook, p. 164; the discussion of "forinsecus," p. 178). And sometimes, especially towards the end of the book, the reviewer wondered just what was the author's principle in making up the bibliographical lists that are piled in, some seeming to be out of their logical place and others appearing to be rather pointless compilations. In fact, the bibliography caused the reviewer both admiration and annoyance; there is an astonishing amount of it, and much that is excellent, yet much too that is secondary or out-of-date. And in other places where it is distinctly needed, little or none is given

(e.g., on linguistics, pp. 86, 322). Of course there is a problem in deciding what sort of bibliography should be chosen for a book of this kind, whether that which is scientifically the best, or that which may be supposed to be most handy and interesting to the students, and some combination of the two is probably necessary. Yet this book is meant for advanced students, and much can be said for giving the best titles and editions in all fields, both for their information and as an edifying example to them of how rigorously history ought to be written; and this the more so since Fr. Garraghan bravely shouldered the immense task of writing a volume that will be used for reference as much as for a class text. Even as it stands it is a good and useful work; a thorough revision can make it an excellent one.

CARLETON M. SAGE, S.S.

THE GILGAMESH EPIC AND OLD TESTAMENT PARALLELS. By Alexander Heidel. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1946. Pp. ix + 269. $3.50.

This excellent book contains annotated translations of the Gilgamesh Epic, the Sumerian version of the deluge from Nippur, the Atrahasis Epic, Berossus' account of the deluge, the story of Ishtar's descent to the underworld, the myth about Nergal and Ereshkigal, and an Assyrian prince's vision of the underworld. The translation is preceded by introductory material in which Dr. Heidel discusses the discovery of the tablets, their publication, their sources and their age. For those who do not care to read the text in translation, there is provided a very good summary of the various documents.

Comparison with kindred biblical material is made, and the question discussed as to literary relationship. The author in a brief preface says that he strives—we think quite successfully—to "treat everyone's view with due consideration and to present the material *sine ira et studio.*"

The author belongs to the conservative school, and his conclusions will, I think, bring joy to all orthodox Protestant and Catholic scholars. For example, after pointing out the great superiority of the biblical material from an ethical and religious standpoint, he concludes the section on "Death and Afterlife": "These differences set the eschatology of the Mesopotamians and that of the Hebrew as far apart as the east is from the west. It is therefore quite obvious that the eschatology of the Old Testament did not develop from that of the Babylonians and Assyrians." He accounts for what similarities there are on the basis of common observation or a common heritage. In his concluding remarks on "The Story of the Flood" the author points out the surpassing excellence of the Biblical account in that it is a punishment inflicted *by*

the one omnipotent God as a moral judgment in punishment of man's sinfulness (italics ours). As to literary relationship he remarks, "It is obvious from all this that the arguments which have been advanced in support of the contention that the biblical account rests on Babylonian material are quite indecisive." He favors the thesis that both accounts revert to a common source of some kind, although he states quite frankly that this position cannot be proved.

This book deserves a place on the shelves of every scripture student, apologist and theologian.

JOSEPH L. LILLY, C.M.

THE CHINESE CONSTITUTION. By Pan Wei-Tung. 2nd ed. Washington, D. C.: The Institute of Chinese Culture, 1946. Pp. xi + 327.

This study of forty years of Chinese activity in the making of a workable constitution is thorough and well documented. With the increased interest of America in China and things Chinese, it would be well if this work came into the hands of many readers here. From it the American reader will gain a greater appreciation of the task which has confronted the builders of China in their efforts to place that great country on the same plane as other great powers and to give it a constitution which would serve it as those of other countries serve them.

From the Three Principles of the People, devised by Dr. Sun Yat-Sen, comes the spirit of the Organic Laws and of China's Constitution. It is of interest to note this at a time when stories are appearing concerning the calling of a People's Congress to adopt a permanent Constitution of the Republic of China and to decide when it shall become effective. The work is not yet complete, of course, but ultimately the principles of freedom of assembly, speech and press under law are expected to be adopted. Then will come the problem of dealing with questions of local self-government. This staggering burden of work has not discouraged those who look ahead in China and the day will surely come when the people will be able to exercise the four political powers of election, initiative, recall, and referendum.

The Constitution is being worked out in accord with accepted principles for such documents, but the real test will come after it is adopted, when both the people and their elected representatives have an opportunity to show what they understand by it. It becomes important, then, to make certain that every one understands what it means and feels a deep sense of allegiance to the fundamental law of the land. This is what the leaders of China are now trying to develop in their fellow-citizens through the work of educators, cultural workers, and religious leaders. Americans, realizing what it means to have officials, soldiers, and new

citizens swear to uphold the Constitution, will be very sympathetic toward these efforts of the Chinese to create the same spirit in their people.

For those who are interested in seeing how the Constitution in China has taken form in the years since 1908, the author has included various documents in the appendices of his work. There is a copious bibliography and a complete index at the end.

This book is recommended for those who are interested in the developments in China, and for those as well who are interested in the more abstract techniques of the drafting of Constitutions in general.

THOMAS OWEN MARTIN

AFTER BLACK COFFEE. By Robert I. Gannon, S.J. New York: The Declan X. McMullen Company, 1946. Pp. 184. $2.00.

Collected addresses, particularly of the after-dinner variety, frequently have a fossil and dated quality that keeps most of the edition in the author's or publisher's attic or finds it remaindered out on bargain boxes in front of second-hand book stores. Not so with *After Black Coffee*. Fr. Gannon has managed to infuse a delightful sparkle and wit into the written as well as the spoken word and to convey to a broad public some very important, if not everywhere popular, truths. If for no other reason than for the technique of his presentation, this volume is highly recommended to priests who are called upon to give occasional speeches.

Twenty-one speeches make up the book, grouped into those delivered to business men, professional men, Irishmen (evidently Fr. Gannon is a favorite with the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick), non-Irishmen (which designation appears to embrace Chinamen, Latin Americans, Poles, and Republicans) and simply fellow men, ranging from Jews and Christians to those included under the "Jesuit Enigma."

As might be suspected, Fr. Gannon is here engaged in the process of conveying basic Catholic truths and observations to audiences which are for the most part of mixed persuasions. Without losing the twinkle in his eye, he never pulls his punches. A Christian humanist, he constantly stresses the need of conserving the Greco-Latin tradition, the importance of preserving knowledge as well as of increasing it, of standing fast by the principle of absolute truth and moral principles, and of showing up the pragmatists as the prophets of chaos.

Running through these addresses is also a profound appeal to the sense of personal responsibility which Americans, and particularly Catholic Americans, have in conserving the Christian heritage of the past and applying it to the problems of these times. Particularly fine

are such pieces as "The Hedgemaster," "The Women of Ireland," and "Art and Tradition." His speech on "Public versus Private Schools" is a masterful analysis of the need of keeping strong the forces of educational and individual initiative.

Perhaps it is needless to say that one of the most eloquent of the speeches is for the Sons of Xavier. "Of course I am prejudiced," says Fr. Gannon, "but you know sometimes I think St. Ignatius would still recognize his Company even after four hundred stormy years." This fine volume will not hurt the reputation of Jesuit Fathers for their ability to face up to the problems of the times.

JAMES A. MAGNER

COLLECTED PAPERS OF EVELYN UNDERHILL. Edited by Lucy Menzies. New York and London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1946. Pp. 240. $2.75.

The first thirty-four pages of this work contain an introduction by the Anglican bishop Lumsden Barkway. The other remaining pages are a collection of lectures and addresses by the late Evelyn Underhill, written during the years 1922 to 1937. These papers were first published as pamphlets and all have been out of print for some time, except *Life as Prayer*. These former pamphlets are the ten chapters of the present volume. The titles of these chapters are very intriguing for any one interested in spiritual subjects, as for example, *Life as Prayer; The Inside of Life; What is Mysticism?; The Parish Priest and the Life of Prayer*. Evelyn Underhill was not a Catholic, yet her mystical works evince a deep understanding of Catholic doctrine, and a clear and practical presentation of that doctrine. Her ability to express old technical terms in modern English without sacrificing any of the elements of beauty and power of the original is well known. Her definition of mysticism as "the passionate longing of the soul for God, the Unseen Reality, loved, sought and adored in Himself for Himself alone" (p. 124), reminds one of Plotinus, St. Bonaventure, and Gerson. The other definition: "Mysticism is man's conscious Godward trend" (p. 129), is a good adaptation of St. Bonaventure's *Animi extensio in Deum* . . . Catholic priests will appreciate what she writes in the seventh chapter on the priest's life of prayer: "The man whose life is coloured by prayer, whose loving communion with God comes first, will always win souls" (p. 141). She proposes the example of the Curé d'Ars as the pattern and patron saint of parish priests. Soon, however, she associates the saintly Curé d'Ars with Wesley and George Fox, and thus we are reminded that the author is not a Catholic. The long introduction gives a comprehensive synthesis of her spiritual development and of her works.

PASCAL P. PARENTE